

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXCVIII.]

JUNE, 1861.

[VOL. XVII.]

## STANLEY'S EASTERN CHURCH.\*

THIS goodly volume—among the first fruits of the revival of the professorial system in Oxford—consists of two parts. The Introduction is formed by three lectures on the Study of Ecclesiastical History, delivered by Professor Stanley on his first entrance upon his duties in the spring of 1857, and “reprinted, partly for the sake of presenting them in a more correct form than that in which they first appeared, partly for the sake of exhibiting the general plan under which will be comprised any special lectures, like those which form the bulk” of the volume under our notice. The “Lectures on the Eastern Church” are twelve in number. The first is general and introductory; the second, third, fourth and fifth are devoted to the Council of Nicæa; the sixth deals with the character of the Emperor Constantine, the seventh with that of Athanasius; the eighth has for its subject the relations of Mahometanism to the Eastern Church; while the ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth are concerned with the Church of Russia. Each is preceded by a list of authorities from which more detailed information than is given in the lecture itself may be derived.

This brief epitome of the table of contents will be sufficient to warn the reader that he must not expect to find here anything like a complete treatment of the History of Eastern Christianity. All that Professor Stanley attempts is to seize upon a few salient and characteristic features. In his treatment even of these, disquisition is largely mingled with narrative. The Council of Nicæa is the only event of which he fully and adequately tells the tale; though even here he is more solicitous to paint a lively picture than to produce a complete and exhaustive story. Nor, however we may wish that he had applied his great powers to the composition of a Church History worthy to take its place in English literature by the side of Milman's Latin Christianity, has the fair critic a right to find fault with the method of the work. As academical prelections, addressed to hearers to whom the study

\* Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church; with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. London—Murray. 1861.

of ecclesiastical history is of the highest importance, yet who are compelled to its pursuit by no collegiate or professional necessities, these lectures are entitled to the greatest praise. The only objection which we feel inclined to make is, that those on the Russian Church take for granted in the hearer or reader knowledge which he is not often likely to possess. Constantine, Athanasius, Mahomet, are personages of whom every educated man has formed a definite idea; but we are not ashamed to own that we never heard of the Patriarch Nikon till we opened Canon Stanley's book, and even now should hesitate ere we presented ourselves for a civil-service examination on the family history of the Romanoffs. But this is, after all, a trifling matter compared with the great and varied merits of these lectures. We can conceive of nothing better calculated to excite in the minds of those who heard them the desire of a more minute and independent study of ecclesiastical history. There may be some who still look upon the story of the Christian Church as a mere stirring of dry bones, which it were better for the interests of all liberal learning to leave to moulder where they lie. To such we earnestly commend Canon Stanley's work. At his bidding, the dry bones live. We watch the bishops slowly pacing the roads which from all parts of the east and west converge upon Nicæa; they are clothed once more with their individual speech and manner and personal peculiarities; we read their character in their history, past and to come; the passions of the age again fill the air with angry debate; and the creed of universal Christendom emerges from the dust and confusion of the assembly, before our eyes.

The style of these lectures is clear, lively, picturesque, often somewhat diffuse—better fitted, as was right, for speech than for writing. Canon Stanley is already well known as an accomplished Eastern traveller; and when he speaks of Nicæa, Constantinople, Alexandria, Moscow, he enhances the interest of his narrative by the vivid description of localities. He employs, too, all the resources of a wide and varied knowledge; often startles the reader by an apt comparison, brought to his subject over many centuries and from a distant corner of the world; like a true historical artist, never forgets that the human race is the same through all generations, and therefore never despises any source of legitimate illustration. He is eminently fair and liberal in his estimate of characters and events; and were it not that the occasion of his lectures justified and almost compelled him to introduce a frequent mention of the English Church, it might be difficult to ascertain what was his own dogmatic position. More than once, with a courage which at this moment is worthy of the highest commendation, he almost goes out of his way to refer to and to quote from "*Essays and Reviews*" in terms of assent and approval. But, after all, the greatest merit of Dr. Stanley's work—and one that eminently fits him for the performance of a



better work than this—is his power of infusing a strong human interest into a story which in some hands would be dull and dead indeed. He has a remarkable faculty of looking at the personages of his narrative from the inside—of learning to know and of presenting them to his readers, not as bundles of qualities, but as men. Saint and heresiarch, emperor and prophet, czar and patriarch—he knows them all, and, with a rare versatility of sympathy, can own and honour the nobler part of each. Characters of old historic renown appear in his pages in a new light; not that, as the fashion now is, he attempts to reverse the moral verdicts which the assent of ages has ratified, but simply because he has a clearer appreciation than most historians of the many-sidedness of human nature. To those who love to describe character in a phrase, who think that any man may be sufficiently labelled with a single epithet, Canon Stanley's estimates of Constantine and Mahomet will only suggest unpleasant difficulties and uncertainties. But the philosophical student will often have occasion to own his obligations to an insight which transforms the puppets of history into living men.

We pass over, as having been published before, the three introductory lectures on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. The first of the lectures which are occupied with the real subject of the work, treats in general of the Eastern Church—maps out its divisions, distinguishes its epochs, notes its characteristics, and vindicates its claim to the attention of the student. Dr. Stanley, remarking that the field of ecclesiastical history occupied by the Eastern Church “is a field rather of space than of time,” and “marked out rather by tracts of land and races of men than by successive epochs in the progress of events, of ideas or of characters,” nevertheless distinguishes three periods in the history of Eastern Christianity, each of which he illustrates at more or less length. The first of these is the period of the seven great Councils, which, though held while Christendom was still undivided, were in locality and character distinctly Oriental. To this belong the lectures on the Council of Nicæa, that on Constantine and that on Athanasius. The second period, illustrated rather than treated in the eighth lecture, is that of Mahometanism, which, both in its origin and effects, may be considered as a rebellion against Eastern Christianity. The third period comprises the modern development of the Eastern Church in Russia, and occupies the four last lectures of the course.

Canon Stanley draws with firm hand the line of demarcation between Eastern and Western Christianity:

“The distinction which has been most frequently remarked is that of the speculative tendency of the Oriental, and the practical tendency of the Western Church. This distinction is deep-seated in the contrast long ago described by Aristotle between the savage energy and freedom of Europe, and the intellectual repose and apathy of Asia. It naturally

finds its point and expression in the theology of the two Churches. Whilst the Western prides itself on the title of the 'Catholic,' the Eastern claims the title of 'Orthodox.' 'The East,' says Dean Milman, 'enacted creeds, the West discipline.' The first decree of an Eastern Council was to determine the relations of the Godhead. The first decree of the Pope of Rome was to interdict the marriage of the clergy. All the first founders of theology were Easterns. Till the time of Augustine, no eminent divine had arisen in the West; till the time of Gregory the Great, none had filled the papal chair. The doctrine of Athanasius was received, not originated, by Rome. The great Italian Council of Ariminum lapsed into Arianism by an oversight. The Latin language was inadequate to express the minute shades of meaning for which the Greek is admirably fitted. Of the two creeds peculiar to the Latin Church, the earlier, that called 'the Apostles,' is characterized by its simplicity and its freedom from dogmatic assertions; the later, that called the Athanasian, as its name confesses, is an endeavour to imitate the Greek theology, and by the evident strain of its sentences reveals the ineffectual labour of the Latin phrases, 'persona' and 'substantia,' to represent the correlative but hardly corresponding words by which the Greeks, with a natural facility, expressed 'the hypostatic union.' And still more, when we touch the period at which the divergence between the two Empires threw the two Churches farther apart, the tide of Grecian and Egyptian controversy hardly arrived at the shores of Italy, now high and dry above their reach.

"Probably no Latin Christian has ever felt himself agitated even in the least degree by any one of the seventy opinions on the union of the two natures which are said to perplex the Church of Abyssinia. Probably the last and only question of this kind on which the Latin Church has spontaneously entered, is that of the Double Procession of the Spirit. The very word 'theology' (*θεολογία*) arose from the peculiar questions agitated in the East. The Athanasian controversy of Constantinople and Alexandria is, strictly speaking, *theological*; unlike the Pelagian or the Lutheran controversies, it relates not to man, but to God."—Pp. 24—27.

From this fundamental distinction are deduced other "cognate differences." "The Western theology is essentially logical in form, and based on law. The Eastern is rhetorical in form, and based on philosophy." So while the practical doctrines, if they may be so called, of redemption, satisfaction, salvation—in a word, the Augustinian theology—are characteristic of the one, the essence of the other is to be found in the debates on the nature of the Godhead. Monasticism has its origin and true home in the East; the words which describe it—as, for instance, hermit, monk, ascetic, abbot—are none of them Latin; and while the monastic orders of the West have always manifested a tendency to preserve points of contact with external life, those of the East have retreated further and further into the depths of speculative retirement. The Eastern Church is stationary, the West progressive; doctrine and ceremony remain in the one what they were in the days of the great Councils, in the other have been modified by lapse of time and change of nationality; while



it is a strangely significant fact that a Pope introduced into Europe the new calendar, which Russia alone of civilized nations still refuses to accept. The marriage of the clergy, the absence of a fully organized hierarchy crowned by a supreme Pontiff, the low condition of religious art, the use of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue, the want of missionary zeal, and, as a corollary to this, the freedom from the spirit of persecution, are all facts which distinguish Greek from Latin Christianity. They form in themselves a sufficient justification for the pursuit of this study by the Western scholar, apart from the somewhat apologetic considerations which Dr. Stanley has summed up under the head, "*Lessons of the Eastern Church.*" Without going so far as to believe that a form of Christianity which must be characterized as eminently stationary and superstitious has a peculiar instruction to impart to English Churchmen of the 19th century, we may well admit that the faith of so many millions of Christian men deserves a more thoughtful and general investigation than it has ever yet received.

The Council of Nicæa—the first, of course, of the two celebrated assemblies of the Church held in that city—is the event in the history of Eastern Christianity upon which Canon Stanley expends the largest space and the most minute narration. He dilates upon its importance as the first of a series of events—the Œcumenical Councils—which, however great the influence which they exercised upon the Church, have now, in all probability, come to an end; as the occasion upon which Christianity and the Empire met, for the first time, face to face; as the birthplace of the only Creed which is still accepted by East and West alike; as the settlement of a controversy, in comparison with which the lesser and transitory debates of the later councils fade into insignificance. It met at the beginning of the summer of the year 335, the twentieth of Constantine's reign. It was naturally convened in an Eastern city: the quarrel which it was to settle was not only of Alexandrian origin, but one which was in the highest degree oriental in form and substance. Constantinople as yet was not: what more appropriate place for a general council than Nicæa, an ancient and well-known city of Bithynia, communicating with the Propontis, and therefore with every Mediterranean coast, by the lake on which it lay, and bearing the well-omened name of the City of Victory? The opening of the third lecture, in which Canon Stanley describes his own impressions of Nicæa, affords a fair specimen of the air of reality which his experiences of Eastern travel enable him to give to his story.

"In the close of the month of May, 1853, it was my good fortune to be descending, in the moonlight of an early morning, from the high wooded steps of one of the mountain-ranges of Bithynia. As the dawn rose, and as we approached the foot of these hills, through the thick

mists which lay over the plain there gradually broke upon our view the two features which mark the city of Nicæa.

"Beneath us lay the long inland lake—the Ascanian Lake, which, communicating at its western extremity by a small inlet with the Sea of Marmora, fills up almost the whole valley;—itself a characteristic of the conformation of this part of Asia Minor. Such another is the Lake of Apollonius, seen from the summit of the Mysian Olympus. Such another is the smaller lake seen in traversing the plain on the way from Broussa.

"At the head of the lake appeared the oblong space enclosed by the ancient walls, of which the rectangular form indicates with unmistakable precision the original founders of the city. It was the outline given to all the Oriental towns built by the successors of Alexander and their imitators. Antioch, Damascus, Philadelphia, Sebaste, Palmyra, were all constructed on the same model of a complete square, intersected by four straight streets adorned with a colonnade on each side. This we know to have been the appearance of Nicæa, as founded by Lysimachus, and rebuilt by Antigonus. And this is still the form of the present walls, which, although they enclose a larger space than the first Greek city, yet are evidently as early as the time of the Roman Empire; little later, if at all, than the reign of Constantine. Within their circuit all is now a wilderness; over broken columns, and through tangled thickets, the traveller with difficulty makes his way to the wretched Turkish village of Is-nik (*εἰς Νίκαιαν*), which occupies the centre of the vacant space. In the midst of this village, surrounded by a few ruined mosques, on whose summits stand the never-failing storks of the deserted cities of the East, remains a solitary Christian church, dedicated to 'the Repose of the Virgin.' Within the church is a rude picture commemorating the one event which, amidst all the vicissitudes of Nicæa, has secured for it an immortal name.

"To delineate this event, to transport ourselves back into the same season of the year,—the chestnut woods then as now green with the first burst of summer, the same sloping hills, the same tranquil lake, the same snow-capped Olympus from far brooding over the whole scene, but, in every other respect, how entirely different!—will be my object in this Lecture."—Pp. 94, 95.

To Nicæa there came up from all parts of the world the eager disputants—bishops, with many attendant deacons and presbyters, to the number of 318. The West was but poorly represented by eight prelates. Sylvester of Rome was prevented by age and infirmity from taking the place of honour, if not of absolute precedence, which would have been accorded to the Bishop of the imperial city; but two presbyters, in whom the ingenuity of a later age has seen the germ of legates *a latere*, were there to represent them, and Hosius of Cordova, a man whose abilities and virtues gave him an almost Papal position, sat by the side of the Emperor. A place of equal honour was occupied by Eusebius of Cæsarea, the historian whose works are among the most precious remains of Christian antiquity, and who, though in this debate he held with the losing side, was pre-emi-



nent as the friend and favourite of Constantine. But we have no desire to write the history of the Council: all our wish is to induce our readers to go for themselves to Dr. Stanley's fascinating pages. And among the most vivid of his descriptions are those in which he depicts the leaders in this fray.

"The groupe which, above the rest, attracts our attention, is the deputation from the Church of Egypt. Shrill above all other voices, vehement above all other disputants, 'brandishing,' as it was described by one who knew them well, 'their arguments, like spears, against those who sate under the same roof, and ate off the same table as themselves,' were the combatants from Alexandria, who had brought to its present pass the question which the Council was called to decide. Foremost in that groupe in dignity, though not in importance or in energy, was the aged Alexander, whose imprudent sermon had provoked the quarrel, and whose subsequent vacillation had encouraged it. He was the Bishop, not indeed of the first, but of the most learned, see of Christendom. He was known by a title which he alone officially bore in that assembly. He was 'the Pope.' 'The Pope of Rome' was a phrase which had not yet emerged in history. But 'Pope of Alexandria' was a well-known dignity. *Papa*, that strange and universal mixture of familiar endearment and of reverential awe, extended in a general sense to all Greek Presbyters and all Latin Bishops, was the special address which, long before the names of patriarch or of archbishop, was given to the head of the Alexandrian Church. . . .

"But close beside the Pope Alexander is a small insignificant young man, of hardly twenty-five years of age, of lively manners and speech, and of bright, serene countenance. Though he is but the Deacon, the chief Deacon, or Archdeacon, of Alexander, he has closely riveted the attention of the Assembly by the vehemence of his arguments. He is already taking the words out of the Bishop's mouth, and briefly acting in reality the part he had before, as a child, acted in name, and that, in a few months, he will be called to act both in name and in reality. His humble rank as a Deacon does not allow of his appearance in the conventional pictures of the Council. But his activity and prominence behind the scenes made enemies for him there, who will never leave him through life. Any one who has read his passionate invectives afterwards may form some notion of what he was when in the thick of his youthful battles. That small insignificant Deacon is the great Athanasius.

"Next after the Pope and Deacon of Alexandria we must turn to one of its most important Presbyters—the parish priest, as we should call him, according to the first beginnings of a parochial system organised at Alexandria, the incumbent of the parish church of Baucalis. In appearance he is the very opposite of Athanasius. He is sixty years of age, very tall and thin, and apparently unable to support his stature; he has an odd way of contorting and twisting himself, which his enemies compare to the wriggings of a snake. He would be handsome but for the emaciation and deadly pallor of his face, and a downcast look, imparted by a weakness of eyesight. At times his veins throb and swell, and his limbs tremble, as if suffering from some violent internal complaint—the same, perhaps, that will terminate one day in his sudden and frightful death. There is a wild look about him, which at first sight is startling.

His dress and demeanour are those of a rigid ascetic. He wears a long coat with short sleeves, and a scarf of only half size, such as was the mark of an austere life; and his hair hangs in a tangled mass over his head. He is usually silent, but at times breaks out into fierce excitement, such as will give the impression of madness. Yet, with all this, there is a sweetness in his voice, and a winning, earnest manner, which fascinates those who come across him. Amongst the religious ladies of Alexandria he is said to have had from the first a following of not less than seven hundred. This strange, captivating, moon-struck giant is the heretic Arius—or, as his adversaries called him, the madman of Ares, or Mars. Close beside him was a groupe of his countrymen, of whom we know little, except their fidelity to him, through good report and evil: Saras, like himself a presbyter, from the Libyan province; Euzoius, a deacon of Egypt; Achilles, a reader; Theonas, Bishop of Marmarica in the Cyrenaica, and Secundus, Bishop of Ptolemais in the Delta.

“These were the most remarkable deputies from the Church of Alexandria. But from the interior of Egypt came characters of quite another stamp; not Greeks, nor Grecised Egyptians, but genuine Copts, speaking the Greek language not at all, or with great difficulty; living half or the whole of their lives in the desert; their very names taken from the old heathen gods of the times of the ancient Pharaohs. One was Potammon, Bishop of Heracleopolis, far up the Nile; the other, Paphnutius, Bishop of the Upper Thebaid. Both are famous for the austerity of their lives. Potammon (that is, ‘dedicated to Ammon’) had himself visited the hermit Antony; Paphnutius (that is, ‘dedicated to his God’) had been brought up in a hermitage. Both, too, had suffered in the persecutions. Each presented the frightful spectacle of the right eye dug out with the sword, and the empty socket seared with a red-hot iron. Paphnutius, besides, came limping on one leg, his left having been hamstrung.”—Pp. 112—117.

“From Neocæsarea, a border fortress on the Euphrates, came its confessor Bishop, Paul, who, like Paphnutius and Potammon, had suffered in the persecutions, but more recently, under Licinius. His hands were paralysed by the scorching of the muscles of all the fingers with red-hot iron. Along with him were the Orthodox representatives of four famous Churches, who, according to the Armenian tradition, travelled in company. Their leader was the marvel, ‘the Moses’ as he was termed, of Mesopotamia, James, or Jacob, Bishop of Nisibis. He had lived for years as a hermit on the mountains; in the forests during the summer, in caverns during the winter: browsing on roots and leaves like a wild beast, and like a wild beast clothed in a rough goat-hair cloak. This dress and manner of life, even after he became bishop, he never laid aside; and the mysterious awe which his presence inspired was increased by the stories of miraculous power, which, we are told, he exercised in a manner as humane and playful as it was grotesque; as when he turned the washerwomen’s hair white, detected the impostor who pretended to be dead, and raised an army of gnats against the Persians. His fame as a theologian rests on disputed writings.”—Pp. 119—120.

“And now come two, of whom the one probably left the deepest impression on his contemporaries, and the other, if he were present at all, on the subsequent traditions of the Council. From the island of Cyprus there arrived the old shepherd Spyridion, a shepherd both before and



after his elevation to the episcopate. Strange stories were told by his fellow-islanders to the historian Socrates of the thieves who were miraculously caught in attempting to steal his sheep, and of Spyridion's good-humoured reply when he found them in the morning, and gave them a ram that they might not have sat up all night for nothing. Another tale, exactly similar to the fantastic Mussulman legends which hang about the sacred places of Jerusalem, told how he had gained an answer from his dead daughter Irene to tell where a certain deposit was hidden. Two less marvellous, but more instructive, stories bring out the simplicity of his character. He rebuked a celebrated preacher at Cyprus for altering, in a quotation from the Gospels, the homely word for 'bed' into 'couch.'—'What! are you better than He who said 'bed,' that you are ashamed to use His words?' On occasion of a wayworn traveller coming to him in Lent, finding no other food in the house, he presented him with salted pork, and on the stranger's declining, saying that he could not as a Christian break his fast,—'So much the less reason,' he said, 'have you for scruple; to the pure, all things are pure.'

"These wonderful powers were exerted, it was reported, actually on his journey to the Council. One night, he, with a cavalcade of Orthodox Bishops, arrived at a caravanserai, where, as it so chanced, a party of Arians were assembled also on their way to Nicæa. The Arians determined to seize this opportunity of intercepting the further progress of so formidable an accession to their rivals. Accordingly, in the dead of night, they cut off the heads of all the horses belonging to Spyridion and his companions. When, as is the custom in Oriental journeying, the travellers rose to start before break of day, the Orthodox Bishops were dismayed at the discovery of what had befallen their steeds. A word from Spyridion, however, was sufficient to rectify the difficulty. He replaced the decapitated heads, and his party proceeded on their journey. When day broke they found that the miracle, performed in the dark and in haste, had restored the heads at random: black heads to white shoulders, white heads to black shoulders; in short, a caravan of piebald horses.

"Many more stories might be told of him, but (to use the words of an ancient writer who has related some of them) 'from the claws you can make out the lion.' Of all the Nicene fathers, it may yet be said that in a certain curious sense he is the only one who has survived the decay of time. After resting for many years in his native Cyprus, his body was transferred to Constantinople, where it remained till the capture by the Turks. It was thence conveyed to Corfu, where it is still preserved in the cathedral of that island. Hence, by a strange resuscitation of fame, he has become the patron saint, one might almost say the Divinity, of the Ionian islands. Once a year in solemn procession he is carried round the streets of Corfu. Hundreds of Corfiotes bear his name, now abridged into the familiar diminutive of 'Spiro.' The superstitious veneration entertained for the old saint is a constant source of quarrel between the English residents and the native Ionians. But the historian may be pardoned for gazing with a momentary interest on the dead hands, now black and withered, that subscribed the Creed of Nicæa.

"Still more famous (and still more apocryphal, at least in his attendance at Nicæa) is Nicolas, Bishop of Myra. Not mentioned by a single ancient historian, he yet figures in the traditional pictures of the Council

as the foremost figure of all. Type as he is of universal benevolence to sailors, to thieves, to the victims of thieves, to children,—known by his broad red face and flowing white hair,—the traditions of the East always represent him as standing in the midst of the assembly, and suddenly roused by righteous indignation to assail the heretic Arius with a tremendous box on the ear.”—Pp. 124—127.

We have no space to follow Dr. Stanley through his interesting account of the deliberations of the Council, which would lose all life and worth in such an abridgment as we could give. He well points out that, in the lapse of centuries, the word Arian, like many others which describe changing and developing systems of religion, has altered its meaning, and that the Arianism of Arius contained in its characteristic assertion, that “there was when the Word was not,” nothing inconsistent with much that now passes for orthodox Trinitarian doctrine. But although the Creed of Nicæa was adopted under circumstances which gave it a peculiar claim upon the faith of the Church,—and though, as we have already said, it is the only Creed accepted by East and West alike,—it is a singular fact that it now exists in more than one form, none of which is exactly the same as that sanctioned by the assembled bishops. The Nicene Creed now current in Eastern churches is really a creed adopted at the Council of Chalcedon, held in 431, and contains dogmatic statements as to the Incarnation and the Holy Spirit not to be found in the original document. Even this has been further altered in the West. Besides several verbal changes of minor importance, the addition of the words “*filioque*,” to express the double procession of the Spirit, is significant of the chief doctrinal ground of the great schism of Christendom. The inability of forms to embalm faith may be learned from the history of the earliest and most authoritative of œcumenical creeds.

The lecture on the Emperor Constantine in his relation to the Eastern Church is interesting as exhibiting from a new point of view a character on which historical students have long passed an almost unanimous verdict. To the Western, and especially the Protestant reader, the recollections called up by the name of Constantine are of the long and bloody struggle for the purple, the mysterious fate of Crispus, the cool and selfish state-craft with which he converted the Church into the instrument of his ambition, the death-bed baptism with which he strove to wash away the ingrained stain of crime. But to the Eastern Christian he is a saint and more than a saint—canonized with the special title *ισαπόστολος*—equal to an apostle. We quote Dr. Stanley's vivid description of his person and character.

“I have already described him as he appeared in the Council of Nicæa. Handsome, tall, stout, broad-shouldered, he was a high specimen of one of the coarse military chiefs of the declining Empire. When Eusebius first saw him, as a young man, on a journey through Palestine before



his accession, all were struck by the sturdy health and vigour of his frame; and Eusebius perpetually recurs to it, and maintains that it lasted till the end of his life. In his later days his red complexion and somewhat bloated appearance gave countenance to the belief that he had been affected with leprosy. His eye was remarkable for a brightness, almost a glare, which reminded his courtiers of that of a lion. He had a contemptuous habit of throwing back his head, which, by bringing out the full proportions of his thick neck procured for him the nickname of *Trachala*. His voice was remarkable for its gentleness and softness. In dress and outward demeanour the military commander was almost lost in the vanity and affectation of Oriental splendour. The spear of the soldier was almost always in his hand, and on his head he always wore a small helmet. But the helmet was studded with jewels, and it was bound round with the Oriental diadem, which he, first of the Emperors, made a practice of wearing on all occasions. His robe was remarked for its unusual magnificence. It was always of the Imperial purple or scarlet, and was made of silk, richly embroidered with pearls and flowers worked in gold. He was especially devoted to the care of his hair, ultimately adopting wigs of false hair of various colours, and in such profusion as to make a marked feature on his coins. First of the Emperors, since Hadrian, he wore a short beard.

"He was not a great man, but he was by no means an ordinary man. Calculating and shrewd as he was, yet his worldly views were penetrated by a vein of religious sentiment, almost of Oriental superstition. He had a wide view of his difficult position as the ruler of a divided Empire and divided Church. He had a short dry humour which stamps his sayings with an unmistakable authenticity, and gives us an insight into the cynical contempt of mankind which he is said to have combined, by a curious yet not uncommon union, with an inordinate love of praise. He had a presence of mind which was never thrown off its guard. One instance, at least, he showed of consummate foresight and genius. He had the capacity of throwing himself, with almost fanatical energy, into whatever cause came before him for the moment.

"We have seen from his dress, and we see also from his language, that he was not without the wretched affectation which disfigured the demeanour of the later Emperors. Against one great old Roman vice, that of voracious gluttony, he struggled, but struggled in vain. The Christian accounts all speak of his continence. Julian alone insinuates the contrary. It was only as despotic power and Eastern manners made inroads into the original self-control of his character that he was betrayed into that disregard of human life, in his nearest and dearest relationships, which, from the same causes, darkened the declining years of the Grecian Alexander and the English Henry."—Pp. 219—221.

We indicate the view which Dr. Stanley is disposed to take of the character of Constantine in the single remark, that he mentions him in the same breath with Cromwell. He saw visions and dreamed dreams. The explanation of the supernatural events which shew so strangely against the background of his persistent worldliness and ambitious craft, is to be sought, not in any conscious scheme for deceiving those who were ready to be deceived,—not even in the credulity of a credulous age,—but

in the vein of enthusiasm, in the proneness to superstition, which mingled in this strange compound of human faculties. The fanatical paganism of Julian, the pilgrimages of Helena, the sincere Arianism of other members of the royal house, are quoted as evidences of a similar peculiarity running through the whole family. What stranger idea than that of Constantine *preaching*—the unbaptized Emperor gravely, if not sincerely, enforcing the truths of Christianity upon venerable bishops! Yet such, if we can trust Eusebius, was his habitual practice.

“Not only did he at the festival of Easter spend the night in prayer with every appearance of devotion, and even preside at the most sacred ceremonies, but he alternately as student or teacher took part in Christian preaching. The extravagant adulation of his followers hardly left him any choice. Eusebius attributes to him little less than inspiration: ‘We do not instruct thee, who hast been made wise by God. We do not disclose to thee the sacred mysteries, which long before any discourses of men God Himself revealed, not of men nor by men, but through our common Saviour, and the Divine vision of Himself which has often shone upon thee.’ If he did listen to the sermons of others, it was regarded as an act of the highest condescension. Eusebius has left us an account of one which he himself delivered to ‘the marvellous man,’ as he calls him, on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It was in the Palace. There was a crowded audience. The Emperor stood erect the whole time; would not be induced to sit down on the throne close by; paid the utmost attention; would not hear of the sermon being too long; insisted on its continuance; and, on being again entreated to sit down, replied, with a frown, that he could not bear to hear the truths of Religion in any easier posture. More often he was himself the preacher. One such sermon has been preserved to us by Eusebius. These sermons were always in Latin; but they were translated into Greek by interpreters appointed for the purpose. On these occasions a general invitation was issued, and thousands of people flocked to the Palace to hear an Emperor turned preacher. He stood erect; and then, with a set countenance and grave voice, poured forth his address; to which, at the striking passages, the audience responded with loud cheers of approbation, the Emperor vainly endeavouring to deter them by pointing upwards, as if to transfer the glory from himself to heaven.

“He usually preached on the general system of the Christian revelation; the follies of Paganism; the Unity and Providence of God; the scheme of redemption; the judgment; and then attacked fiercely the avarice and rapacity of the courtiers, who cheered lustily, but did nothing of what he had told them. On one occasion he caught hold of one of them, and drawing on the ground, with his spear, the figure of a man, said: ‘In this space is contained all that you will carry with you after death.’”—Pp. 232—234.

We pass over the lectures on Athanasius and Mahometanism, to give some account of those on the Russian Church. They form the portion of the book which will offer the greatest attraction of novelty to the ordinary student of ecclesiastical history, though, for a reason which we have before given, they hardly



equal the earlier lectures in interest. Dr. Stanley divides the history of the Russian Church into four periods—foundation, consolidation, transition, reformation. The first of these extends from the close of the tenth century to the beginning of the fourteenth. Vladimir, a chieftain of Norman descent, was the founder of Russian Christianity. To him—so runs the story—came, in the year 986, “envoys from the different religions of the then known world”—Bulgarian Mussulmans, ambassadors from Rome, Jews, even a “philosopher from Greece.” Each party told its tale with varying effect. Then in the next year Vladimir sent out ambassadors to visit and to judge of the various religions in their native seats. St. Sophia at Constantinople was then the centre point of Christian ritual, as St. Peter’s at Rome now is: nowhere was the service of God so solemnly, so awfully, so gorgeously performed as in the metropolitan cathedral of the Eastern Church. The barbarian ambassadors gazed in amazement, and carried back to Vladimir the tale of their wonder. Not long after, the Prince, besieging the Crimean city of Cherson, vowed that if he succeeded he would be baptized. Success attended his arms: he demanded and received in marriage Anne, sister of Basil, emperor of Constantinople, and with his people was admitted to the communion of the Church. A general ceremony of baptism was performed at Kieff. Russia was thenceforward Christian, and Vladimir shares with Constantine alone the sacred title of *Isapostolos*—equal to an apostle.

The second period of Russian Church history, that of consolidation, extends from the beginning of the fourteenth to the middle of the seventeenth century. The sacred books have now been translated into the Russian language; the land is covered with monasteries; Moscow and the Kremlin become the centre of the national religious life. The Czar is head not only of the State, but of the Church,—a rude barbarian caliph upon the Scythian plains. To him the people submit uncomplainingly: even Ivan the Terrible, the most loathsome monster who ever ascended a throne, provokes no attempt at revolution: a cruel and tyrannical Czar is a visitation of God. Next to the Czar comes the Metropolitan of Moscow; and under him a countless tribe of clergy, secular and religious. Monks innumerable fill stately monasteries in town and country,—not, like their Western brethren, divided into many orders and performing many half secular functions, but all owning one rule, and realizing the ascetic Eastern conception of the monastic life. Yet the hermits more than once assumed the prophetic function, and boldly rebuked the cruelty and oppression of the Czars; while both in the Mongol and the Polish invasions monks were the leaders of the patriotic resistance, and monasteries the strongholds of the land. It is a remarkable fact that the present royal house of Russia is of ecclesiastical origin, and dates its rise from

the last of these troubles. When the race of Ruric was extinct, Michael Romanoff grasped the falling sceptre. He was the son of Philaret, once a simple parish priest, afterwards Patriarch of Moscow, and of Martha, his wife.

The period of transition, from the middle of the seventeenth to the beginning of the eighteenth century, is represented by the Patriarch Nikon. Dr. Stanley thus introduces him :

"Our present concern is with the Patriarch Nikon. In naming his name we feel at once the immense disadvantage of Eastern as compared with Western history. How few of us have ever heard of him : how impenetrable even to those who have heard of him is the darkness of the original language in which his biography is wrapped up ! Yet he is unquestionably the greatest character in the annals of the Russian hierarchy ; and, even in the annals of the Eastern hierarchy generally, there are but few who can be ranked before him as ecclesiastical statesmen. Photius in the ninth century, and Chrysostom in the fourth, in some respects remind us of the career of Nikon. Indeed, the similarity may be fairly taken as a proof of the identity of spirit which breathed, at the interval of six centuries, through the two main branches of the Eastern Church. He was a Russian Chrysostom. He was also, in coarse and homely proportions, a Russian Luther and a Russian Wolsey. But here the differences are far more palpable than those which divide him from the Patriarch of Constantinople. Through all the obscurity which hangs over him, there is yet discernible a genuine human character, combining with a willful barbaric obstinacy, as of an overgrown spoiled child, the caustic humour, the indefatigable energy of a statesman of the extremest West. In the series of portraits professing to represent the hierarchy of ancient Russia, his is the first that imprints itself on our minds with the stamp of individual originality. In the various monasteries over which he presided, his grim countenance looks down upon us with blood-shot eyes, red complexion, and brows deeply knit. The vast length of his pontifical robes, preserved as relics of his magnificence, reveal to us the commanding stature, no less than seven feet, which he shares with so many of his more distinguished countrymen. And his story, if it could be told with the details,—many of which lie buried in the Russian archives, but some of which have been published and translated in well-known works,—is as full of dramatic complexity and pathetic interest, as was ever conceived in *Timon of Athens* or *King Lear*."—Pp. 412—414.

Of peasant birth, he rose to be Patriarch of Moscow and bosom friend of the Czar Alexis. For six years he ruled the Russian Church with a high hand. In his way, he was a reformer. He revived the forgotten practice of preaching ; re-introduced the printing-press ; sternly set himself to repress the drunkenness of the clergy ; admitted women to public worship ; encouraged a rude kind of biblical criticism, with the view of obtaining a more perfect translation of the sacred books. But he was a reformer of the true Scythian type,—rude as John Knox himself, with no small admixture of Tartar ferocity. Not only the prisons, but the Siberian deserts, were full of the clergy



who resisted his policy or made themselves amenable to his discipline. Yet he could not only be munificent, like Wolsey, in the foundation of hospitals, almshouses and monasteries, but made large sacrifices in time of plague at Novogorod, and, like Howard, himself visited the prisons. At last he came into conflict with clergy and nobility in regard to some ceremonial reforms, against which the fanatically conservative spirit of Russian religion sternly set itself. His enemies seized an opportunity of embroiling him with the Czar, with whom he had lived, like Becket with Henry, a friend nearer than a brother. He resigned his patriarchate in a moment of irritation, and retired to a monastery, only to deplore with unavailing regret the sacrifice which he had made and was unable to bear. For eight years he refused to acknowledge any successor to his see: then an attempt to recover his lost dignity ended in his trial and condemnation. He was banished to a distant monastery, where he spent nine weary years. At last Alexis, on his death-bed, sent to implore his forgiveness. The forgiveness was granted, the reconciliation sealed; but the Czar was dead before the messenger returned from the Patriarch's prison, and Nikon was forgotten for three years more. Then the young Czar, Theodore II., recalled him to the scene of his old triumphs. But it was too late. The old man died on the boat which was bearing him down the Volga; and the convent of the New Jerusalem, which long before he and Alexis had jointly built in exact imitation of the sacred city, received but his corpse. There, concludes Dr. Stanley,

“— he rests, far enough removed from the ideal of a saintly character, but yet having left behind him to his own Church the example, which it still so much needs, of a resolute, active, onward leader; to the world at large, the example, never without a touching lesson, of a rough reformer, recognised and honoured when honour and recognition are too late. He closes the whole epoch of Russian history of which he was the central figure. His life, as has been strikingly observed, extends itself over the whole period of the Russian Patriarchate, which was in fact the period of transition from the old Russia to the new; and already there was born to the Imperial House that still greater Reformer, who in the next generation was to carry out more than all that Nikon in his highest dreams could have anticipated, if not for the Christianisation, at least for the civilisation, of the clergy and people of Russia.”—P. 450.

For the story of the last period of Russian Church history, that which extends from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the present day, we refer the reader to Dr. Stanley's pages. The character of Peter the Great is well known, nor does Dr. Stanley take any new view or throw any fresh light upon it. And the topics of the last lecture are themselves too cursorily treated to suffer any abbreviation at our hands. While acknowledging the deep interest of this, as of the other lectures in the

volume before us, we are compelled to wish that the author had spoken with more systematic minuteness of matters on which he is so well informed, and of which most of his countrymen know so little. But it is hard to dismiss with words of depreciation a volume from which we have derived so much pleasure. It is a good omen for the progress of Christian learning in England that the mantle of Dean Milman has fallen upon one who, in many ways worthy to be his successor, is especially so in the possession of the same kindly spirit of impartiality. If Dr. Stanley never succeeds in reserving from the Professorial duties which he discharges with such diligence, time enough to produce a great and lasting work of Church History, we must seek consolation in the thought, that he could hardly be better occupied than in infusing into the minds of more than one generation of Oxford clergymen, the breadth of view and the liberality of spirit which so eminently characterize these excellent lectures.

---

#### THE LATE GEORGE HOLT, ESQ.\*

THERE was no subject of public concern that enlisted Mr. Holt's sympathies more warmly and steadily in its behalf than Popular Education. In this great cause he was ever willing to spend and to be spent. He considered it as an all-important matter in two points of view: first, as the chief means of raising the intellectual and moral condition of the individual man; and, second, as being, in the last resort, the great bulwark of the constitution: for, the political franchise having been placed, by the Reform in Parliament already alluded to, within the reach of every man who by the exercise of moderate diligence and steadiness chose to attain it, he looked to education as the instrument which should teach every citizen to exercise that great privilege wisely and justly. Therefore he took unceasing interest in all schemes in any way connected with the education and improvement of the young. When a member of the first Town Council elected after the passing of the Municipal Reform Act, he took willing part in establishing the Corporation schools, which were intended to provide a perfectly unsectarian education, at the town's expense, for the children of the poor. These schools carried out their object very successfully for many years; but when the opposing political party gained a majority in the Council chamber, the basis of admission was so much altered as practically to exclude the children of Roman Catholics, always

---

\* Continued from p. 272.



the poorest, and in Liverpool not the least numerous, part of the inhabitants.

Early in the year 1835, he established a comfortable reading-room in his own neighbourhood, which he provided with an ample selection of books—novels and magazines as well as books of history, biography and travel—and also with the local newspapers on both sides in politics, and a daily London paper. Although no theological works of any kind were admitted, and all the books there were of a generally useful and entertaining nature, yet this undertaking excited such violent opposition from the minister of Edge-Hill church at the time, that after a fair trial it was found to be practically useless, and was accordingly given up.

The Mechanics' Institution owed its first and comparatively humble origin mainly to the exertions of that most philanthropic man and early reformer, the late Egerton Smith. In 1835, Lord Brougham laid the foundation-stone of the present commodious buildings in Mount Street, towards the erection of which Mr. Holt was a liberal contributor, and of which he continued an active director to the very period of his decease, never failing to attend its committee meetings and in every possible way to promote its success. That Mechanics' Institution gradually rose to be the most important in the kingdom, having for many years an income of about £10,000; three day-schools; evening classes with some 1600 pupils; above 60 teachers and officers; 3500 members; a large library, museum, sculpture-gallery and lecture-room, where twice a week lectures were delivered, frequently to as many as 1200 hearers. Gradually the uses of the Institution changed; it became less of a Mechanics' Institution and more of a great public school; and that, under the more appropriate name of the "Liverpool Institute," it still continues to be, numbering at this present time in the high school, 146 pupils and 14 teachers; in the commercial school, 622 pupils and 20 teachers; in the evening school, including the art classes, 360 pupils and 10 teachers; besides the pupils and teachers connected with the Ladies' college and the more recently established Queen's college.

The particular department of the Liverpool Institute with which Mr. Holt's name is most indissolubly connected, which may indeed almost be regarded as his own, is its girls' school, Blackburne House. Strongly impressed with the want of suitable schools for girls of the same class as the boys who were receiving their education in the Institute, and feeling keenly the almost paramount importance of providing a sound, useful education for women, he, in the year 1844, purchased, in the immediate vicinity of the Institute, a large house and grounds, which he leased to the directors at an almost nominal rent. The additional sum of money necessary to prepare the premises for their

object, to purchase books and other school furniture, and give the undertaking a fair start, was immediately subscribed, and a public meeting was held to inaugurate the undertaking, over which the late Lord Sefton presided. With reference to this event, Mr. Holt makes the following entry in his diary :

"1844, Jan. 29, Monday. Called on Mr. Wyse at the Adelphi. In the course of the day he walked over Blackburne House, the new girls' school, expressing himself much delighted therewith both as to situation and general capabilities. In the evening, at half-past seven, the meeting came off, and that most successfully—the room quite full and highly respectable. The chairman performed his part well; the speakers the same; and the people, by a contribution of nearly £900, the same. Thank God !"

But other words than his own shall tell the tale of that school's origin. In November last, a member of Mr. Holt's family received a letter in acknowledgment of one in which allusion was made to his failing strength. The following paragraphs are taken from that letter :

"Glad though I was to receive your letter, part of its contents has saddened and depressed me greatly; and many times daily does it return to my thoughts. It is inexpressibly painful to hear of the decline of which you tell. Rarely indeed has it been my fortune to be so thoroughly intimate with one so much my senior as Mr. Holt; never, where there has been on my side so steady a growth of affection and respect—I may truly say, of reverence. I well remember (as if it were only a few weeks ago) our driving out together to Croxteth Hall, in 1844, to solicit the Earl of Sefton to preside at the meeting which was to inaugurate the opening of Blackburne House school. Full of the project, we were for a long time silent, each occupied with meditations of his own. Suddenly I was startled from my reverie by Mr. Holt's exclaiming, 'Persons must be very intimate with each other before they can be long silent when together!' I was then much struck with the remark, and I have thought of it often since. There is a silence of awkwardness, and there is a talking which seeks only to break that silence. Very different is the silence of those who need not words to know that each thinks and feels as the other, and who do not forget the chain of sympathy that unites them, though they are not perpetually rattling its links.

"There is, I firmly believe, a contagiousness of good, as *well* as—perhaps as *strong* as—of evil in this world; and this I found in my intercourse with Mr. Holt. At an earlier stage of the arrangements for establishing the girls' school, while yet the house was unpurchased, he spoke to me one day of her whom you had lost not long before, and he said in his own simple manner, 'I do not know that I could bestow this money in a



way more likely to be pleasing to her little spirit.' I have sometimes tried, but always failed, orally to repeat these words, so very touching have they ever seemed to me. Cold indeed I must have been had I not been profoundly moved by this blending of fatherly affection, religious faith, and pure and wise benevolence. From that hour I felt more deeply than ever before that it was indeed a holy work in which we were engaged, and that it was truly for me a blessed privilege to be allowed to co-operate with him in the promotion of its success. That it has so signally succeeded, thus far, must be to him, and to you also, a source of much consolation, even though it is the thought of such things that gives poignancy to sorrow."

Blackburne House was the first school of the kind established in the kingdom: it was opened in July 1844, and its unmistakable success at once proved the public need for and appreciation of such an establishment. Under the admirable management of Miss Ellison, this school has prospered to a degree exceeding the most sanguine expectations of its founder. It is self-supporting, and contains twenty teachers, eight normal teachers, and 300 pupils, the impossibility of admitting more being the only check upon its numbers.

It is simply impossible to cite here all the entries in Mr. Holt's diary on the subject of the Mechanics' Institution: they are both longer and more numerous than any others. One or two may be given as shewing the feelings out of which his steady support of that Institution arose.

"1849, June 17. During the whole of last week, a good deal engaged at the Mechanics' Institution—examinations going on on Wednesday and Thursday both in the boys' and girls' departments. On Friday, distribution of prizes to the girls at eleven, in the theatre (of the Institution), and to the boys at seven: on both occasions, being President, it fell to my lot to distribute the prizes. Besides this, we have had many meetings under much consideration relating to the high school, contemplating a complete change therein. Also Mr. Brown's gift of £250 has been matter for considerable discussion. Upon the whole, we have hopes of putting the Institution upon a still better footing than ever: perhaps the department of the lower school, under the able superintendence of Mr. M'Ilveen, can hardly be amended; and upon the whole, especially including the girls' school, much good is going on. Lacking a general system of education, applying by enactment to the whole of the people, free from sect or party, how can we render a better service than by organizing in the best way we can an Institution of this kind, which meets the wants of all classes, trading, commercial and professional, and by the combination of numbers secures these advantages at the lowest possible charge? Next to good laws, and intimately co-operating with them, educating the people seems the most

important function for the government of a free state. With this view of the question, one can cordially devote any spare means, as well as apply any spare time, to furthering so patriotic and laudable a purpose."

Again, on the 16th of March, 1851, after mentioning many changes that had taken place in the Institution, he goes on thus: "As the schools are really and truly as efficient, and perhaps more so, than they have ever been for giving a good commercial education to all classes and both sexes, without interfering in any way whatsoever with the notions of any one, religious or others, and so good a proof is hereby shewn of what may be done nationally (education of the people *much wanted*), I cannot withhold my steady and constant attendance upon all the duties falling upon me as one of the directors. I do not see how I can more effectually and usefully fill up my place as a member of this great community than by giving all the help and countenance in my power. Accordingly, although nearly all my early associates in the direction have waxed cold and withdrawn, I feel the more called upon to stick closer to so great a principle."

One other extract shall conclude this subject:

"1846, Dec. 23. In the evening at a *soirée* of the teachers and officers of the Mechanics' Institution held in Blackburne House; on which occasion the whole body of teachers, male and female, presented me with a very valuable book; also another to Mrs. Holt, very handsome. An address to me was made by Dr. Hodgson, the Principal, in the name of the parties. I was much gratified by such a mark of goodwill, and thanked them accordingly. Nearly 200 persons, the teachers and their friends, were present."

A friend who knew Mr. Holt intimately (more intimately than any one in his connection with the Liverpool Institute), writes of him thus in a biographical notice recently published:

"It may well be asked, how one whose private business was on so large a scale, and who was much involved in all the public affairs of a swiftly-growing community, and especially in local improvements of every kind, should have been able to devote to education so large a portion of his time and thought. The answer lies deep in the character of the man. Methodical habits, a calm temperament, an unfaltering will, and a head as clear as his heart was warm, enabled him, without apparent effort, to accomplish more than seemed possible for any individual. His motto, '*Certum pete finem*' (with arrow-head as crest), was eminently characteristic. Through life, his aim was single, steady and sure. How, without noise or show, to effect the greatest good, was ever his main purpose; and his conviction never wavered that in education all, and especially the highest, interests of mankind are rooted. He knew enough to be desirous that others should know more. He was chiefly self-taught,



indeed, but well taught; and though a man of the world rather than of books, of action than of speculation, wise much more than learned, he appreciated justly both literature and science, and he was not ignorant of either. His literary taste was healthy and simple, yet catholic. Shakspeare and Burns, especially, he often quoted aptly, and with a keen sense of enjoyment. For the perception of all beauty, whether in nature or in art, he had a clear, just eye. But moral beauty charmed him most. All that was pure or generous or heroic, stirred him deeply and with no barren admiration. He ever thought more of others and for others than himself; and riches and honours both he viewed as means of usefulness, for which he was responsible as trustee rather for others' advantage than his own. Wealth could not elate him whom no poverty could have degraded. To make him either proud or mean was beyond Fortune:

With her wild wheel he went not up or down,  
For he was MAN, and master of his fate.

Honours came to him unsought, and he bore them with manly, unaffected meekness. His prosperity none could envy, for it was honourably earned and nobly used. 'He looked the whole world in the face,' not merely because 'he owed not any man,' but because he feared or hated no one: he would fain have loved all men,—and he had nothing to conceal. Disguise was as foreign to his nature as was ostentation. He was singularly open, candid, truthful; and if he did not seem precisely what he was, it was because he was more and better than he seemed. Those who saw only his easy, cheerful, often playful manner, might not suspect the depth of earnestness below, that manifested itself not in grave looks or wordy professions, but in persistent action. Phrases he left to others; he was content with deeds. Instead of laying merely posthumous foundations, he gave of his means freely while he lived, and vigilantly tended their application. Large money donations for worthy objects, from those who can afford them, are truly less a merit than a privilege, if not a duty. But he gave what was to him more costly, and to others much more valuable: he gave, year after year, his time, his thoughts, his experience, his foresight, his influence. With no small sacrifice of leisure, of literary tastes, of home society, which no man (and with reason) could prize more dearly than did he—and latterly, we fear, even of his health—he held on his way till failing strength warned him that the night was at hand. Punctual as the hour, he came to council meetings, morning or evening, and remained always till their close. It ever seemed as if the business in hand was his only concern in life; he shrank from no tedium of details, for he knew the importance of little things, and thought nothing too humble to be ennobled by high motive. His opinions he expressed briefly, clearly, temperately, in such words as came, and

he almost persuaded even when he did not convince. Men differed from him reluctantly, and with a half-suspicion that they were wrong. But difference of opinion was with him no ground of quarrel; he arrogated no superiority, and never dreamed of imposing his own will. It did not occur to him to doubt either others' right to think or his own liability to err. Nor did the mere mechanism of education engross his care. His genial, unpatronizing sympathy went to the heart of many a teacher, and breathed fresh interest into the daily round of duty: it nerved the desponding, and made even sorrow less forlorn. Thus, when visiting the United States, ten years ago, he travelled far merely to see a former teacher of the Liverpool Institute; and we doubt not that this mark of friendly remembrance long cheered the exile of a most sensitive and worthy man. As became a lover of nature and of all simple pleasures, he rejoiced in the society of the young: a well-ordered school-room, with its rows of happy faces—the happier by reason of his presence—was to him not a reward or an encouragement, for he needed neither, but a great delight, enhanced by anticipations of their opening future, not unmingled, perchance, with visions of his own past. Many an eye, of both taught and teacher, that used to brighten at his coming, has been dimmed by the thought that on earth he shall no more be seen for ever: but his memory will live deep in the hearts of all who knew him; for to know him was to love him, with a love the warmer the more intimate the knowledge.”\*

In October 1859, a few friends of Mr. Holt, chiefly connected with him in the management of the Liverpool Institute, met for the purpose of considering some means by which they might express their appreciation of his long and valuable services. They resolved not to confine this expression of regard to themselves, but to admit the co-operation of others; and at a meeting subsequently held in the office of William Brown, Esq., it was unanimously agreed that a subscription of sums not exceeding £5 should be entered into, for the purpose of procuring a portrait of Mr. Holt, to be placed in the board-room of the Institute. Mr. Holt was much touched by this mark of his friends' regard; and when they would not comply with his request to content themselves with a simple written expression of approbation, he cheerfully fell in with their wishes, and sat for his portrait to Mr. Robertson, and his bust to Mr. MacBride, of Liverpool. Neither of these was entirely completed in February; but a testimonial embodying the resolutions passed at the meeting, and beautifully illuminated on parchment, was presented to Mr. Holt a few days before his death.

While thus actively engaged in so many matters of general public concern, Mr. Holt was not neglectful of the various cha-



rities and interests which more peculiarly belong to our own small religious community. To these he was always a liberal subscriber; but, with few exceptions, they did not need, and therefore did not obtain, his personal supervision. He always felt an especial interest in the welfare of our small outlying country congregations, regarding them as the sure nestling-places of civil and religious liberty. In travelling, therefore, he always aimed at spending the Sunday, if possible, in some place where there was a church of Unitarian Christians within reach. If the congregation was very small or seemed poor, he would generally enter into conversation with some one after the service, and rarely leave without a more substantial mark of his fellow-feeling than its mere expression in words, though he could always make that very welcome. In this way the old endowed chapel at Buxton attracted his notice more than most, and he endeavoured to draw the attention of others both to the possibility of its permanent improvement under the charge of a settled minister, and to its temporary need of restoration, towards the expenses of which he gladly contributed.

The little congregations of Unitarian Christians which have of late years sprung up in his native district elicited his warm sympathy and support. He knew the character of the people, and he knew that the simple, earnest faith which had commended itself to his own head and heart, was precisely that which would meet the needs of that shrewd and yet devoutly disposed race.

When, in the year 1856, it was determined to erect a handsome new Unitarian church in Rochdale, on the site of the old chapel in Blackwater Street, Mr. Holt was invited to lay the corner-stone. Even then his health caused him to hesitate a little before accepting an honour of which he was very sensible, lest he might fail in the suitable performance of its requirements. His scruples on this point, however, were overruled; and on Wednesday, the 23rd of April, 1856, the weather being remarkably propitious for the ceremony, the stone was successfully laid. The account of the whole proceedings on the occasion may be found in the June number of the *Christian Reformer* of that year, from which we will extract the few concluding sentences of Mr. Holt's address. "He said, with the apostle, let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He, for one, never felt disposed to find fault with any man who differed from him in opinion. He had known good men and sincere Christians in many different sects and classes. If sectarianism did not distil its bitterness into the heart, the spirit of Christ might prevail with equal power in every different sect and party. He congratulated his friends in Rochdale on the happy omens which attended the good work they had begun. It was not without very pleasurable emotions that he appeared that day in his native town, which he had quitted as a boy almost half a century ago. It was most gratifying to

him to be called upon to perform the honourable office which the kindness of the members of that congregation had devolved upon him, and he sincerely thanked them for the distinction. He hoped and believed that the house which they had begun to build would be a house of God. It was his earnest wish that the spirit of godliness might flourish there. He was far less anxious for the success of any peculiar set of opinions amongst them, than he was that Christianity might be ever preached in those walls and illustrated in the lives of successive worshippers. He begged them to bear always in mind the object which, as Christians, they ought to aim at in every work they undertook. Other foundation can no man lay than is laid by the doctrine, the life and the example of the divine Founder of Christianity, who enjoined his disciples to love one another, and who also said, 'If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him.'" On the occasion of laying the corner-stone of this chapel, the congregation presented Mr. Holt with a beautiful mallet and silver trowel. In his diary of the ensuing year, we find this entry:

"1857, June 12, Friday. Attended yesterday by invitation and appointment at the opening of the new Unitarian chapel in Blackwater Street, Rochdale. Mrs. Holt went with me. Mr. Martineau preached the sermon; the regular minister, Mr. Smith, performing the other parts of the service, which commenced at half-past twelve. After it was over, a party of about seventy ladies and gentlemen assembled at dinner in the public hall at three o'clock. Having been appointed to preside on the occasion, I took the chair accordingly, and upon the whole the meeting after service, as well as the opening and dedication of the chapel itself, went off pretty well. Having been honoured by laying the foundation-stone of this chapel, I could not feel otherwise than gratified to see its satisfactory completion."

Similarity of opinions and great esteem for each other's honourable character had induced a warm friendship between Mr. Holt and Mr. Rawdon, and when that gentleman, in the year 1853, first entered upon his benevolent scheme for eking out the stipends of the ministers of our smaller chapels, he was greatly strengthened in his purpose by the ready sympathy and steady support of his friend, on whose judgment and assistance he placed the greatest reliance. With reference to this subject we will again quote from Mr. Holt's diary:

"1853, June 5. Conversation from time to time with Mr. Rawdon upon the subject of replacing to some extent the Lady Hewley fund. Many of our small Unitarian chapels in country places and small towns are likely to die out without some aid of this kind. Paid my subscription to the fund for this object last week. Already provision for educating our ministers is made



on an ample scale by the Manchester New College, now removed to London. Mr. Hibbert's legacy provides also for the scholarships and maintenance during preparation and for the course in taking the degree; and this fund now aimed at, and to which £12,000, by twelve persons of £1000 each, has been already subscribed, would go in some measure to provide the necessary addition to the very limited stipends by which a minister may just subsist. Without this last, where is the inducement for a young man to devote himself to this work? It is in vain you provide the means for preparation, unless you also shew the means of subsistence for after life. On this account, and from a conviction that the Presbyterian and Unitarian body have been a nursery for patriotism and civil and religious liberty, it is that I most cordially co-operate with my friend Rawdon in the object at which he is aiming."

It remains to endeavour to give some poor, unworthy portrait of this in all respects excellent man and good citizen, there where he shone most, in that happy domestic circle where henceforth and for ever is a great blank. There to each and all he was the tender, sympathizing, judicious friend, always ready to heighten every pleasure and lessen every sorrow by sharing it; taking, during their early years, as much apparent interest in his children's absorbing cares for pigeons and rabbits, pigs and pony, as if he had no weighty affairs of his own to occupy his mind. When they were still very young, he purchased a little shaggy Welsh pony, had soft side-saddle and pad made for it, and, leading-string in hand, set off on summer evenings and Sunday afternoons on country rambles (they were then possible at no great distance from his house) with as many of his children as could ride and walk in turn by his side; and they were ever out with him in garden or fields before his early eight-o'clock breakfast hour. The Saturday afternoon was the time looked forward to by them for the whole week, for then "Papa" generally came home an hour or two earlier than on other days; his advice on all their little affairs could be obtained more deliberately; and there was more time for the tales, poems and songs, listening to which he would keep them entranced round his knee for hours; and he would finally take off to bed as many as he could carry in his arms or as could mount upon his back. Then, the children safely laid in bed, came on the quiet hours of reading and conversation with his wife. He was a husband and father of rare devotedness. He lived for his wife and children, and gained all he desired—their unbounded confidence and love, which growing years and experience of the world only served to strengthen and increase. They need no elaborate description of him whom they have lost; his living image is graven on their hearts; but if ever they need words to recall him to their memory, they feel that in none can an epitome of his noble character be so truly found as

in the great apostle's delineation of Charity. There is not a single phrase in those ever-memorable lines which does not apply with strict justice to him, whom they never knew to say an unkind word or do a selfish thing:

“Charity suffereth long, and is kind; envieth not; vaunteth not itself; is not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly; seeketh not her own; is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.”

In November, 1856, Mr. Holt retired from the Liverpool Town Council, and ceased to take any active part in public life, strictly so called. He spent his few remaining years usefully and happily, in the discharge of his magisterial duties, in attending many various committees for the furtherance of philanthropic objects, in travelling with his family, and still more in residing frequently with them at a cottage he rented near Windermere, where in the society of a few friends he could indulge his love of nature, and where he enjoyed with ever-increasing thankfulness and delight the beautiful scenery that lay all around him. His health had been failing for some time—the labours of the last two years in Council had been too much for his strength—and he was urged by his medical adviser to try the effect of the baths of Wildbad, in Würtemberg. Thither he went last August, accompanied by several of his family, and derived, as they fondly hoped, benefit from the waters; but, in November, a great increase of bodily weakness began to make itself perceptible. This went on steadily increasing—gradually at first, rapidly at last; nothing that had to be given up one day was ever resumed another. On the 4th of February, he took a short drive; on the fifth, he was unable to come down stairs; but moved daily to the last from his bed-room to a sitting-room on the same level. Bodily weakness could scarcely be greater, but the mind was clear and serene as ever, and cheerful as far as strength permitted. No murmur ever escaped his lips, no impatience ever shewed itself on his countenance; nothing but the most perfect peace—thankfulness to God for the great mercy of being spared physical suffering, and to those about him for the love which led them to endeavour to forestal every want, to provide every comfort; he “did not think things could have been made so easy” to him. The last hours were the most easy of all; the little difficulty he had experienced in breathing ceased; and in full possession of consciousness, with his wife and all his children gathered round his bed, he passed away as gently as a little child falls asleep.

He died on the evening of Saturday, the 16th of February, and was interred on the following Friday in the burial-ground of the Ancient Chapel, Toxteth Park. The funeral was very simple,



and strictly private as far as family arrangements were concerned ; but the local newspapers stated that a greater number of persons followed him to the grave than had been gathered together in Liverpool for a similar purpose since the death of Huskisson.

We have obtained permission to conclude this memoir with an extract from the sermon preached on the Sunday after Mr. Holt's funeral, by his highly-valued friend and pastor for thirty years, the Rev. J. H. Thom. The text is from the seventh verse of the fourth chapter of Philippians: "The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."

"Sometimes we have to thank God for those whose peace sufficiently reveals whence it came, so manifest is it in its issues—the springs of whose character are deeply reflective and spiritual, but so genuine, that the light comes to the surface and marks the whole man—a light which, however it may pass understanding, because it issues out of faith, is yet, in the simplicity of its existence, open and perceptible to all. A life abounding in the signs and fruits of peace, in gentle strength, whilst the spirit that supplies these expressions is hid with God—these, perhaps, are always the two elements of religious Health—manifest peace, invisible communion. The peace of Christ was indeed beyond understanding—but that peace there was, and all the fruits of peace, no man could doubt. And this must ever be our definite type of Christian Life—in whatever measure it may be given to the disciple to be as his Lord.

"I have no intention of drawing a character: at no time, and in no place, would I purposely employ myself with that intense, discriminating gaze into the whole of another's being—and here least of all, where our business is not to look into one another's hearts, but to turn our natures to Him whose Spirit can change and create us all anew. Yet is it part of our Christian fellowship distinctly to recognize whatever reflection of Himself God may give us in those of His children to whom we are drawn near; nor is there anything in this life which we may so deeply trust, if we can trust ourselves at all, as that image of a spirit which, unconsciously to itself and without intent of ours, is given off to our souls. In any attempted analysis of all the elements of another's character, I have no confidence at all; in the great outlines of spiritual life, the impress of himself, which one with whom we are familiar silently mirrors on our hearts, I have an absolute faith. Whenever, then, in this place, I speak of another, I speak solely of this resultant image,—and as often as in any measure it is an image of the goodness of God, of a peace whose springs are out of sight, there is nothing in this world that I hold to be less open to doubt.—We have parted with one who gave such an image of himself, and in parting has left its

blessing with us. Let us retain it before us for a little, here where it was not least vivid, and where his serious presence and kindly look, his aspect of true fellowship in social worship, his reverent air of devout communion with both Man and God, will never retouch it again.

“Simply, then, he had that greatest blessing a man can possess—a heart deeply sensible to the mercies of God—so sensible to them as to be spiritually bound by them: this was the underlying secret of all his being—the hidden seed of whatever, as his natural fruit, came forth from him. An earnest feeling of devout Thankfulness, and of all that in a genuine nature is involved in Thankfulness, shaped his spiritual lineaments and wrought his works. His life, you clearly saw, was no effort of force—it was a quiet leaven that was in him. There could not be a man more ready to acknowledge that ‘the lines had fallen to him in pleasant places’—that ‘God was very gracious’—that ‘Goodness and Mercy had followed him all the days of his life;’ nor more true to feel that from such acknowledgment some kindred return to God, in blessing and in peace, could not be separated. All his private life and all his public life,—the life of his affections and his life of beneficence and duty,—and that truest life of all, the *spirit* that is in a man and expresses itself we cannot say how,—must each be referred to the same root: there could not be a character of more simple origination. Hence his happy contentment with the blessings that God had given him,—walking before his household with a pure and perfect heart, swift to hear, slow to speak, *very* slow to wrath, as one not needing to be taught that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God: hence his genial sympathies, his readiness to take pleasure in all the ways of life that God opens to others, though they might not be ways fitting to himself: hence his kind, unwounding temper, his gentleness in counsel, his power of conciliation, his meekness of wisdom, as of one who dwelt too near the Source of mercies, and felt himself too unworthy of the least of them, to make it possible for him to deal with his fellows in a spirit different from that with which he himself was treated: hence, too, his uniform prosperity, his success in whatever he undertook, as one who could wait, who knew at what he was aiming,\* and would not be drawn aside for the sake of what lay out of his way, or that men might propose to him: and hence his strong public spirit; and by public spirit I mean the feeling that life is a trust—that no man lives for himself—that, in any true sense, no man lives at all except as he makes his life an open channel for the goodness of God. Of his works in and for this community there is no need that I should speak, nor of his constancy and perseverance in them: for

---

\* *Certum pete finem*: Mr. Holt’s motto.

I wish to speak not of his good deeds, but of himself, and our chief interest with them here is, that they came forth from the very essence of his character; that his offerings of this kind, where most they assumed the form of a spiritual sacrifice, in which his own personal interest was the strongest, in education and in Christian effort, all grew out of the deepest and most spiritual conviction that was in him—‘Make the tree good and the fruit will be good’—open the heart to God and to His love, and the heart, which is God’s making, will not be barren of returns.

“Nor can I deny myself the satisfaction of saying that to me he was one of the spiritual powers of this place—that, far more effectually than by words, he gave me strength and confidence—that the very manner of his worship here bespoke one who was ready to yield himself to the Spirit whom he came to seek, to enter into any deep experience, to receive any good thing, to respond to any right appeal. And these are influences we cannot afford to lose—that by recognizing we must strive not to lose.

“Within a year, five of the heads of this congregation, of the heads of families or representatives of families, have passed away from us; nor can it be absent from our thoughts that the merciful hand of God lies gently now in peaceful warning upon still another, one of the most honoured of them all. Rich has been the harvest of death within these walls in the last thirty years. My first act as your minister was to preach Roscoe’s funeral sermon. Since then it seems to me that men of a like spirit have gone from us, far, far beyond the average of loss in any other church I know. We all need older and better men to help us upwards—to have, not in Heaven only, those whom we can reverence, on whom we can rest: and when a few more white heads have disappeared from this place, we shall all be weaker than we were. Well, we must remember our Lord’s words, ‘Unless a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.’

“What relative place we may continue to hold in this community, I am not anxious to know, if only this seed shed abroad by the living and the dead has fallen into good hearts. If comparatively we shall not hereafter retain our former place in the ranks of those who see the Right whilst yet a long way off, and labour for it, and bring it to the birth,—even that will be a cause for new thankfulness to God, if it be, not because our love and faith wax cold, but because our fathers did their work, and what was once peculiar to them is now more and more the common heritage of all. God Himself has prophesied a time ‘when a man shall no more teach his neighbour, saying, ‘Know the Lord,’ for they shall all know Him from the least unto the greatest.’ To fulfil that prophecy, we must yet awhile walk in



our fathers' steps. And it is not the least of God's mercies, nor the least of *our* incitements, that so many of those who have passed from the ranks of our fellow-workers and fellow-worshippers below, can now to all the feelings of our hearts so fitly take their place among the Cloud of Witnesses above. One thing alone is needful, which thus is made easier to us, the Faith which worketh by Love,—that whether within or without the veil, in Heaven or yet on Earth, one Spirit may unite us all in the holy fellowship of God!"

---

#### ON THE HYMNS OF THE CHURCH.

SIR,

To assuage, as far as I could, the evil of an ill-timed controversy, I turned aside, in my reply to Dr. Beard, from his "set and formal" attack on the "Hymns for the Christian Church and Home," and addressed myself to the general principles which determine the limits of poetical invocation in Unitarian worship. In pursuing this course, I have neglected, it appears, the only "vital point," and treated a topic not intended for discussion. It may be so: "the real question," with my critic, may be the verdict in his suit against me. But, as we must have the Law before we begin the trial, I shall still endeavour, while vindicating the accused hymns one by one, to clear the rules of judgment, without which sentence must be given in the dark. The following positions have been already laid down:

(1.) There is but One Divine Person,—the Father of all,—who is the Object of Worship and Hearer of Prayer. In His presence and communion we live, as we live with one another. Conversely, all other beings higher than we, including Christ, are beyond our reach, and are not proper objects of prayer and worship.

(2.) As an august reality, however, and the next stage of our own existence, the spiritual world in which Christ lives draws towards it a truly religious affection; and he, as the central figure of its divine society, is the object of a feeling other than that of historical reverence. From that station he has a living power over our hearts, which the written gospel alone could never exercise.

(3.) The natural expression of this intermediate affection is itself intermediate between human conversation and divine communion: it is lyrical apostrophe; in which the mind does justice to the reality and sacredness of the absent object by transiently treating it as present.

I ask no more than this right of apostrophe. But it is said that I have taken more; that the hymns objected to pass beyond apostrophe into prayer, and ascribe to Christ the distinctive

functions of God; that this is a simple matter of fact, open to immediate inspection; and that Ditheism is its logical consequence, whether I am aware of it or not. I am challenged to determine the fact and try the logic. Let us do so.

But how are we to determine the fact? By what criterion do we know a prayer from an apostrophe when we see it? Is the difference visible to every one that can read and parse a sentence? If so, what are its grammatical marks? Happily, Dr. Beard gives us a definite reply. It is the form of "ENTREATY" that makes the difference and begins the evil; to apostrophe, otherwise, he has no objection. The "vocative,"—the form of address,—is innocent, provided it be followed by no imperative mood,—the form of entreaty. This it is that turns apostrophe into prayer, and implies Divinity in the object invoked (p. 304). Certainly, this is a test easily applied, and makes such short work of my case, that Dr. Beard may well grudge me more than "a page or two" on which to make my submission. The rule, however, if it convicts me of Christ-worship, will establish a good many other worships, where idolatry has been less suspected. Here, for instance, it detects one of our own ministers in a strange Paganism:

Then, *Hope*, thy soothing power impart,  
To cheer each anxious careworn heart;  
Shed on our souls thy quickening ray,  
And light us to eternal day!—*J. C. Wallace.*

And another in a downright Bibliolatry:

My Bible! while I live, from thee  
Be my best joys supplied;  
And to the realms of endless day,  
Oh, be my faithful guide!—*J. R. Wreford.\**

And Mrs. Barbauld in an apotheosis of the lost companion of her way, when she says:

Thence may thy pure devotion's flame,  
On me, on me descend;  
To me thy strong aspiring hopes,  
Thy faith, thy fervours lend.—*Hymn 623.*

It is evident from these examples that even the most direct form of entreaty,—expressed in the imperative mood,—is not in itself an evidence of prayer. And, on the other hand, a much feebler form,—the optative "*May I*,"—which in itself is but the soliloquy of desire, is an adequate vehicle of prayer.

When the morn shall bid us rise,  
May we feel Thy presence near!  
May Thy glory meet our eyes,  
When we in Thy house appear!—*Hymn 552.*

---

\* Beard's Unitarian Hymn-book, 1837, Hymns 352, 178.

Yet, that this form may also fall short of prayer is clear from the following address to Christ, from Hymn 163 of the Unitarian Hymn-book :

Yes; in submission, Lord, we bow;  
Thine may we be in spirit now,  
And thine for evermore.—*J. C. Wallace.*

Thus there may be the language of entreaty without prayer, and prayer without the language of entreaty; and if you would distinguish apostrophe from worship, you must look behind the mere form of expression, which is, in both instances, precisely the same. The difference lies in the speaker's faith regarding the object addressed,—“in the presumed presence or absence of that higher being.” Does he feel himself within the real range of personal communion?—then, the very breathing of a wish is prayer. Does he only fling out the arms of affection on the edge of a separating gulf, towards that which lives with him simply in its image and idea?—then, be his words what they may, they remain within the limits of apostrophe: they are not, like prayer, the human half of a colloquy; but the whole of a soliloquy. Suppose, for instance, Luther, with his faith in an ever-present Son of God, to say,

Saviour of men! to us still be  
The way, the truth, the light!  
Till in the heavens we reign with thee,  
Those regions of delight!

the words could not fail to have the full significance of prayer. But, coming as they do from Dr. Wreford, and adopted by Dr. Beard (Unit. Hymn-book, 164), they are addressed to one who in person is not supposed to be here, and they are but apostrophe. There are numerous Unitarian hymns which, on Trinitarian lips, would in like manner change their character. And, vice versâ, language of invocation originally the vehicle of a Lutheran Christ-worship, loses this character, if assumed by a Unitarian as else congenial with his piety. The same forms of speech pass in and out at this door of transition, according to the faith of the mind resorting to them. In order, therefore, to convict a hymn of Christ-worship, it will not suffice to point to the *form of composition* and say,—“Why, look! does it not *ask him for something*, and so attribute to him the Divine function of granting requests?” Such an argument would prove, as an article of the poet's belief, the deity of “Hope,”—of “my Bible,”—of Mr. Barbauld. You must shew that, in the *substance of the invocation*, things are said of Christ which, by Scripture rule, are true of God alone. Whether any such evidence is producible against me, will soon be seen. But I must first consider an objection made to my mode of distinguishing apostrophe from prayer.

The former, I had said, presumes the personal absence, the



latter the personal presence, of the higher being addressed. The following consequence is fastened upon me:

“When Mr. Martineau apostrophizes any of ‘the hierarchy that conducts us across the awful space from our own poor level to the King of saints,’ he performs an act of prayer, for *they are present, since they ‘conduct’ him*; and if he also addresses God, he does not perform an act of prayer, since *God is so absent that conductors are desirable*, if not necessary. It is true that immediately after he intimates that he has to speak to them (‘immortal natures’) ‘across the gulf’ and ‘though we know them beyond reach:’ so that one moment the intermediate hierarchy is near and at another it is remote; but with such an inconsistency I have nothing to do except to mark it” (p. 300).

Dr. Beard, we will suppose, returning from some committee-meeting, tells me,—“Our queer neighbour A. was there; he was civil but distant.” “‘*There*’—and yet ‘*distant*!’” I reply: “what an absurd man you are!—one moment A. is near and at another he is remote: with such inconsistency I have nothing to do except to mark it.” If this would be a miserable word-catching, what else is Dr. Beard’s play with the twofold meaning of my terms of place and movement? There are two measures of an object’s distance from us; it may be distant from our mental apprehension, or distant from our actual person; and God, whose infinitude sets Him furthest beyond the reach of our thought, is of all beings the really nearest to ourselves. And, on the other hand, Christ and the saintly spirits of his higher world present more definite images to our mind as being akin to the type of our humanity, yet are far from the range of personal intercourse. The conceptions we have of them, the reverence we feel towards them, form intermediate links between the social prose of our common life and the supreme piety to God; and thus it is—by helping the spirit, not by bridging space—that they are “a hierarchy conducting us to the King of saints,” or, in equivalent words which my critic cannot disapprove,

the great cloud of witnesses

Which shew the path to heaven.—*Ps., H. & Sp. S., No. 594.*

Is the idea of “*mediation*” between the human and the divine so foreign to Christian theology that, because I speak of mediatorial minds, with Christ as the head and unity of them all, I must be accused of denying the presence of God with our spirits, and setting Him far off in some distant heaven? Nay, at the very moment when I spoke of this spiritual middle distance, I spoke also, with the most positive emphasis, of Him as ever “our associate of the moment and the place,” as “immediately present with us,” as “alone the Real Presence of our diviner hours” (p. 216). It is only by thrusting these expressions of *literal nearness* out of the clauses he pretends to quote, and insulating the terms which speak of *mental distance*, so as not only to alter, but ab-

solutely to reverse, what I had said, that Dr. Beard can attach this imputation to me. Ill as I often express myself, I do not think these words obscure: "We do not live shut up with our associates of the moment and the place,—contemporary men for our morality, the everlasting God for our religion,—and only a formless and empty blank beyond and between" (p. 216). Locally and instantly present with us are two beings,—Man the object of our moral action, and God the object of our religious worship; from level intercourse with the one to the sublime communion with the other, from the equal to the Infinite in spiritual rank, we are not left to pass at a single bound; the intermediate gradations are not blank; conception is helped across by resting-places of secondary veneration. Instead of this, what am I made to say?

"'In the formless and empty blank' which Mr. M. implies as existing 'beyond and between *us and our religion*,' and which he fills up with 'faces of silent appeal to our gratitude and veneration,'—in this blank, recognized as a fact, may possibly be found the reason why Mr. M. pleads for the use of apostrophe in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. To judge by his language, heaven is a place to him, a very distant place, and God dwelling there is afar off from our spirits, and can be effectually approached only by intermediate beings" (p. 301).

The verbal quotation itself, it is obvious, is falsely made; and the meaning of the passage is charged with a doctrine of local mediation which it does not teach, and exhibited as denying that immediate nearness of God to the soul which it positively affirms. On these "inadequate and poor ideas of God," so fastened upon me, the grave reflection is added, that whoever "lives ever in communion with his Heavenly Father, can well spare that 'divine society which to us prevents the Father of spirits being alone,'—as if God alone with man's soul were not the highest blessing and the purest and fullest joy of which we are capable" (p. 302). Yes, doubtless; and if there *be* no "divine society," and we are in the universe alone with Him, He is "our sufficiency." But how stands *the fact*? Is it not true that, *besides* His presence with the soul, there is *also* His presence with his "saints above"? Have I *invented* this, because the other was not enough? If that spiritual world is *there*, are we not to think of it, and of God along with it? Is not He, by his ubiquity, to be the link of co-presence between us mortals and its immortals? while they, in rank of spiritual glory, are a link of sympathy between Him and us? Is it to make *no* difference to us that they live? And is Christ to be to us only an historical person in the Past, the same as if he were not an immortal? If these things are realities, what call is there to "spare" them and blot them out from recognition, and to charge on the disciple who owns them an inexperience in the higher piety?

Apostrophe and worship, then, are not distinguishable externally and rhetorically. Both are addresses, resorting to all moods of the verb, including the forms of "entreaty." The difference is internal, between the quasi-presence and the Real Presence to the speaker of the higher being addressed. Unless Divine attributes are substantively assigned to that being, the address cannot carry on its face any evidence of its being prayer; and its character must depend on the known intent of the persons using it. It remains to apply these rules to the hymns assailed.

Milman's hymn (202) has two verses: in the first ("Lord! thou didst arise and say"), the miracle is historically described of the calming of the storm; in the second ("Lord! thy gracious word repeat"), Christ is apostrophized as the great calming agent of the world, whose spirit alone can prevail over our "restless strife and woes." On this hymn, Dr. Beard says: "Mr. M. does not deny that here worship is offered to Christ; but he leaves it to be implied that if here or anywhere else worship or prayer is offered to Christ, such offering is not incompatible with the acknowledgment of One Divine Person who, as the hearer and acceptor of prayer, is the proper Object of worship." I certainly had said nothing of this particular hymn or any other, if that is what is meant "*not denying*;" but one comprehensive denial I had given, viz., that the Hymn-book "*contains a single piece which compromises in the least*" "the great principle on which there is among us no dispute," that "there is *but One* Divine Person [why, in the quotation, is the word '*but*' dropped out?] who, as the hearer and acceptor of prayer, is the proper Object of worship." Is it possible for words to be more explicit? Do they not, with the most absolute precision, exclude instead of "implying" "worship or prayer offered to Christ"? And was not my whole line of defence this,—that Christ is away in heaven,—that we are on earth,—that all worship or prayer to him is accordingly out of the question,—and that address to him can be only apostrophe? If I did not say enough, however, I *now* deny that Milman's hymn (or any other in the volume) offers any worship to Christ, or differs at all in this respect from the following stanzas of Dr. Wreford's, which I find in No. 209 of my critic's "Unitarian Hymn-book:"

Go forth, O Saviour, conquering still,  
And with thyself the nations fill;  
Till all the earthly kingdoms be  
The kingdoms of the Lord and thee!  
And oh! while we thy triumphs sing,  
Reign in our hearts, thou glorious King!  
There may thy gentle spirit shine,  
And prove us to be wholly thine.

If the Saviour is invoked to "fill the nations with himself," and "reign in our hearts" with "his gentle spirit," "till all



earthly kingdoms," and we ourselves, are wholly won to God and him, is he not to be invoked to "quell" by his "gracious word" "the billows of the proud," that "the earth may find repose"?

"*More emphatic because more express,*" continues my critic, *is the worship of Christ in the following stanzas* from the 328th hymn;" and he then presents us with four verses printed continuously, and with all the aspect of an unbroken extract. The facts are these: the first two verses are direct prayer to God; the last two are an apostrophe to Christ; between these pairs there stands, in the hymn itself, a verse of transition which marks the change of persons, and winds up the prayer to God with the petition—

*Messiah's trusting mind impart,  
To raise my head, and cheer my heart.*

The image of Christ being thus brought before the disciple's eye, he bursts out—

Saviour! where'er thy steps I see,  
Dauntless, untired, I'd follow thee!

The verse of transition, which shews its predecessors to be prayer to One Being and its successors to be apostrophe to another, Dr. Beard suppresses, and makes the whole appear a single address in which Christ is supplicated as Omniscient—

O thou to whose all-searching sight  
The darkness shineth as the light!

This is the kind of citation which drew from me the remark,—  
"By detaching verses from the text, or (*without mark of omission*) *erasing them for the production of a new context*, it is as easy to get false impressions out of poetry as false doctrine out of Scripture." It is right that we should hear Dr. Beard's reply:

"What then," he says, "is the course which I actually pursue? Let the following quotation from my essay (p. 136) answer: 'We indicate the following hymns as containing elements which, with our Unitarian faith, it would be idolatrous in us to use, namely, Nos. 202 [&c.] *We transcribe some of the verses.*' Surely here is an exact specification of the evidence. . . . In employing those words which I have underlined, I 'gave a mark of omission,' if ever a mark of omission was given" (p. 292).

Whether a "mark of omission" which does not indicate *the place* at which the context is broken, is all that we have a right to expect, is a question which, however pertinent, I need not press; for even this warning, I lament to say, *had not been given* to the reader of the mutilated hymn just cited. Be the words, "*We transcribe some of the verses,*" sufficient or insufficient as a notice of what is to *follow* them, they do not touch the cha-

racter of what *precedes* them; and to my complaint of false context on p. 135, it is no answer to quote promissory words from p. 136. Though offered now as a general plea, covering the whole case from the outset, they do not occur till after the main suppression had taken place. They warn the reader that verses *are going to be* "detached;" they do not tell him that they *have been* "erased." And it was against the *erasure alone* that I brought the charge of being left "without mark of omission."

Another instance of wrong juxtaposition, producing a startling effect, occurs in the instance of the 641st hymn. It is Heber's dramatic sketch of the scene at the gate of Nain, opening with an address to the widow in her grief, closing with words spoken to her transport of joy, and having two intervening verses in which the drama of the miracle is presented. These verses it is which give the whole historical character to the poem, and fix the person and the scene; and, but for these, *any* mourning mother, whose sorrow finds, in any age, hope and succour from the Word of God, might seem to be contemplated in the address. By omission of the two dramatic verses, and of the heading of the hymn, Dr. Beard imparts to it a generalized aspect, and totally conceals the fact that it is the widow of Nain who alone is meant, and that the exhortation to "worship and fall before Messiah's knee" is limited to one who is in his actual presence at a moment of awful gratitude and joy. This mode of "producing a new context" is doubtless the regular thing in theology; but as we were quoting not the Scriptures, but the poets, I thought we should go by the code of the men of letters, rather than of the divines.

And now as to the "logical consequences" charged upon these hymns. The former (No. 328) is headed "Prayer for guidance;" on which my critic argues thus: "Prayer" to whom? granting that the first three verses are poured out to God, it is Christ who is addressed in the remaining two. "If Jehovah and Jesus are addressed, then two divinities are implicitly owned" (p. 295). How so? Is then the "addressing" a person equivalent to "owning his divinity"? What then becomes of the admitted right of apostrophe to beings other than God? Or is it meant that what *begins* as proper prayer to God cannot, on the mention of Christ, take a turn into apostrophe, and, with the change of person, descend from colloquy to soliloquy? Such a rule would convict the Book of Psalms itself of manifold idolatry; for nothing is more usual with them than to pass in and out of prayer in the course of a few verses; to look *upward* to God—"O send out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me!"—and then *inward* in a moment—"Why art thou cast down, O my soul?"—or *outward*—"It was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance." What should we think if, having called one of these Psalms "a Prayer" on account of its main character, we

were told, on the strength of these changes of person, that we deified all the objects of address? If from the form we turn to the substance of the hymn's apostrophe to Christ, I know not how to distinguish it from the following stanza in Dr. B.'s "Unitarian Hymn-book:"

Oh, Lamb of God! thy steps may we  
Trace through this world of woe and strife;  
And, blest at length, repose with thee  
In the green fields of endless life.—*Brettell.*

In the other poem (No. 641), the widow of Nain is, in any case, only asked to do what the Canaanitish woman did when "she came and worshiped him, saying, Lord, help me" (Matt. xv. 25; comp. Matt. viii. 2; John ix. 38). But, in truth, the *object* of worship is left unnamed, and only the fitting place and attitude ("before Messiah's knee") are indicated; and the injunction would be fully obeyed did she make the Son the depository of her devout gratitude to the *Father* who "did the works."

Proceeding to the ulterior case of "detached" as opposed to "erased" verses, Dr. B. says: "I added, '*We transcribe some of the verses.*' Here, *again*, the reader is duly warned." No; not "*here again*;" but *here first*: for this is no second warning; but the very words (from p. 136), now at length due, which had already, by ante-dating, played the part of warning the first. Of the double duty which they are thus made to do, as it is delusive to appeal to the first part, so is it superfluous to appeal to the second; for I have never said that the "detaching of verses" was done "without mark of omission." The practice, however, even with notice given, is susceptible of abuse. And no greater abuse can it suffer than this; that where a hymn, having painted in life-like detail a scripture incident, draws from it a moral parallel and application at the last, in which the dramatic form of apostrophe runs on, you cut away the historical picture, and present the apostrophe without the prefix which suggested it, just as if it were *in vacuo* and were said upon its own account. Dr. Beard has thus run his scissors round the whole canvass of Mrs. Hemans' "Stilling of the storm" (209, "Fear was within the tossing bark"), leaving only the motto at the foot—

O thou, that in its wildest hour  
Didst rule the tempest's mood,  
Send thy meek spirit forth in power,  
Soft on our souls to brood!  
Thou that didst bow the billow's pride  
Thy mandate to fulfil!  
O speak to passion's raging tide,  
Speak, and say, "*Peace, be still!*"

To these stanzas, together with the two descriptive lines—

The troubled billows knew their Lord,  
And fell beneath his eye,



the objection is made, that they recognize Christ "as lord of the outer and the inner world" (p. 297). Well; but if in that miracle "he rebuked the winds and the sea," and if he was such a "manner of man that he commanded the winds and the waves and they obeyed him" (Matt. ix. 27; Luke viii. 25), was he not, *quoad hoc*, "lord" of those "troubled billows"? And *has* his "meek spirit" no power to "brood on our souls" and prevail over "passion's raging tide"? What mean we by his "*kingdom* within us," if he is to have no rule over "the inner world"? To say that his supernatural power or his spiritual reign identify him with Almighty God is to fall in with the weakest of Trinitarian commonplaces.

Jeremy Taylor's "Cleansing of the temple" (Hymn 212) shared the fate of Mrs. Hemans's "Stilling of the storm:" the historical prefix was thrown away, and the moral application,—to the purification of the Church by the spirit of Christ,—was criticised as if it were an independent prayer instead of a suggested apostrophe. To turn from the desecration of the temple by traffic to the desecration of the human soul by sin, to welcome the inner authority of Christ as entitled to castigate and able to expel disturbing passions there, to speak of the purified heart of Christendom as "that holy place, which thou hast chosen there to set thy face,"—this, by a compendious argument, is shewn to be an idolatry. "In Scripture, the human heart is said to be the temple of God.\* Here, Christ is addressed as having a temple in human hearts:" therefore—what? Shall we say, "Christ is here made God"? That will hardly do; the fallacy is too transparent: for the same method would shew that since the human heart is a temple of Sin, and also a temple of God,—since, again, fools make a mock at sin, and fools make a mock at God, Sin must be God. So, to repair the flaw in his premisses, my critic scrutinizes the particular words which assign to Christ a shrine in the heart, and detects in them a resemblance (quite unreal) to the language of Solomon's dedication prayer; and, with the gain of this additional point, he is in a condition to argue thus: That Jehovah had chosen a place for a temple was once said in solemn prayer; that Christ has chosen a place for a temple is here said: therefore this is a solemn prayer. But might we not as well reason thus: That God knows all things was once said in solemn prayer (Ps. 139): "Lord, thou knowest all things," was said by an apostle to Christ: therefore Christ was addressed in solemn prayer? The "logic" is no better than before, and is in fact of that trivial kind by which Trinitarian controversialists endeavour to convey over to Christ in the New

---

\* This, however, is not the meaning of the passage referred to, 1 Cor. iii. 16. It is the organism of the collective church, "the body of Christ" (Col. i. 24), and not the individual "human heart," that is called by the apostle "the temple of God."

Testament the functions and attributes of Jehovah in the Old. What should we say to one who tried to convert us thus: Paul (Rom. xvi.) speaks of the churches as *Christ's*: in 1 Thess. ii. 14, he speaks of the church as *God's*: so with him Christ and God were the same? Yet change "church" into "temple," and this is precisely my critic's reasoning. As to the sentiment and imagery of this hymn, they are rigorously scriptural, and justified by every variety of analogical phrase. The human person is "the temple of the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. xvi. 9). Christ dwells in the human heart by faith (Eph. iii. 17). The "church" which is "*Christ's*" (Matt. xvi. 18) is also "*God's*" (1 Cor. i. 2, x. 32), and is the "temple of God" (2 Cor. vi. 16), and the "body of Christ" in which lives the spirit of Christ (Rom. viii. 10, 11), and also the spirit of God (Rom. viii. 9; Eph. ii. 22). It is that "temple not made with hands," which he substituted for the outer structure so near its end in Jerusalem; and where each disciple may find the promise true, that to the loving and faithful heart Christ and the Father will jointly "come and take up their abode." Is Christendom refused the privilege of this rich inheritance of imagery, and forbidden to "welcome" that cleansing triumph of Christ's spirit in "our hearts," which can alone re-consecrate our humanity as God's "house of prayer"? That this prohibitory rigour is really a "*new cry*" is plain from the appearance in Dr. B.'s own "Unitarian Hymn-book" of the following hymn, which he now includes in his Index of Idolatries:

Lord Jesus! come; for here  
 Our path through wilds is laid;  
 We watch as for the day-spring near  
 Amid the breaking shade.

Lord Jesus! come; for hosts  
 Meet on the battle plain;  
 The patriot mourns, the tyrant boasts,  
 And tears are shed like rain.

Lord Jesus! come; for still  
 Vice shouts her maniac mirth;  
 And poverty's a crushing ill,  
 While teems the fruitful earth.

Hark! herald-voices near  
 Lead on thy happier day;  
 Come, Lord! and our hosannas hear!  
 We wait to strew thy way.—*H. Martineau* (205).

Nor of the hymns on the condemned list is this the only one which I find in Dr. B.'s former collection. Has he no fellow-feeling with those who did but follow in his steps? The zeal of penitence always excuses some vehemence of pleading; but it is not usual that all the hard words should be thrown into an indictment, without even a qualifying whisper of confession.

The next hymn (246) is Watts's, "The heavens declare thy

glory, Lord." It has the heading, "*The light of the world.*" On this fact my critic reasons thus: The hymn is *addressed to* "the light of the world:" "the light of the world" (John viii. 12) is Christ: therefore the hymn is addressed to Christ. I reply: the hymn is *not addressed to* the light of the world, but is only *about* the light of the world: and it is the proper business of a heading to state the subject of a hymn, not the object addressed in it. In this case, every line from beginning to end is addressed to God alone, just as much as the 19th psalm, of which the piece is a free version; the main difference being, that the moral light which is paralleled with the natural is, with the Psalmist the law, with Watts the gospel. The "Sun of righteousness" apostrophized in the fourth verse is not a *person*, but an *era*,—the full "*day-spring* from on high," the rising morn of the gospel's golden age; and the invocation is identical in purport with that in Mr. Johns's fine hymn, "Come, kingdom of our God." This is the acknowledged meaning of the phrase in its original place (Mal. iv. 2);\* and to apply it to Jesus personally is to substitute an arbitrary fancy for the sense of Scripture. But were it even otherwise, why would it be idolatrous to apostrophize Christ thus:

Great Sun of righteousness, arise!  
Bless the dark world with heavenly light;

yet permissible to invoke him thus (Psalms, Hymns and Sp. Songs, 225):

Roll on, thou glorious Star of light!  
Display thy matchless grace abroad,  
And chase the darkness of our night,  
And bring the nations home to God.

Mr. Wright's pithy and conclusive vindication of Montgomery's hymn on Prayer (442) remains untouched by Dr. B.'s re-assertion that the last verse is a *prayer* to Christ. This, of course, is precisely what we deny. It is an apostrophe, a soliloquy of desire to learn of him the "path of prayer." Can he then not teach *us*, and could he only teach his *first* disciples, "how to pray"? Do we make him God in ascribing such functions of guidance to him? What, then, means this address to Christ in the "Unitarian Hymn-book" (384)?

My sacred guide! thy rule I own,  
From thee, oh! never may I stray!  
The words of life are thine alone,  
Thou only canst direct my way!

---

\* "*Sol salutis*, i. e. *salutaris*, *tempus quo ex omni malo eripiemini et summâ fruemini felicitate.*" Rosenmüller, in loc. Hitzig (in loc.), however, says, the "righteousness," i. e. "*salvation*," is "*itself their rising sun*, as disaster is darkness and night." In this case the passage is parallel with Is. lxii. 1, "I will not rest till the righteousness thereof go forth as *brightness*, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth."



I have now gone through all the hymns specially cited by my critic, except one (469) to which he has not recurred, and which is not addressed to Christ at all. The same principle applies throughout: that to a confessedly absent being, address, with or without the imperative mood, is not prayer, but apostrophe; and that our spiritual and ideal relations to absent beings may be of a kind to render such apostrophe the natural and innocent expression of affection towards them. What we say under this form, as under any other, must of course be restrained within the limits of truth. On this point, as distinguished from the other, I do not find that the Hymn-book is impeached.\*

It is said that no one would ever, in the exercises of religion, address under forms of entreaty a being conceived to be out of hearing; and that he would recoil from uttering "mere poetry in the guise of religion." But why limit this remark, supposing it to be true, to *entreaty*? Is not *exhortation* to an absent being, or *telling* him something, just as truly "mere poetry" as *asking* him something? Tried by the test of prose reality, all varieties of apostrophe must go together; the fiction lies in *speaking at all* to one who does not hear, and not in optative as distinguished from indicative speech. There is no end to the havoc which this intolerance of ideal forms of thought would make, not only with our psalmody, but with the whole natural utterance of human faith and affection. Insist on superficial truth,—which is often essential falsehood,—and how absurd to exhort the stars, to suggest that the floods should clap their hands, to retaliate on the possible impiety of the sun by saying,

Or may the Sun forget to rise,  
If he forget his Maker's praise!

How far-fetched, and in fact hopeless, for men in Manchester or elsewhere to request the angels to sing! Are there angels? Can they sing? Will they do so on request? How should the request reach them? Then, again, there is that "suffering habitation of earth" whom Mr. Roscoe, and after him several considerable congregations, asked to "go" and "retrace his journey to the skies." Who may that be? Did he hear what was said to

---

\* Except indeed in one instance. Dr. B. quotes from the "Morning Hymn" of the Alexandrine MS. the petitions, "Jesus Christ, have mercy upon us; have mercy upon us; receive our prayer; have mercy upon us;" and says that here we have entreaty "in words similar to those in Mr. Martineau's Hymn-book" (p. 304). To receive human prayers and bestow mercy on the suppliants, are functions of God alone, and in no line of my Hymn-book are ever attributed to Christ.

This Morning Hymn, says my critic, "Mr. Martineau declares '*is evidently alluded to by Pliny.*'" I said nothing of the kind. I quoted this as Bunsen's opinion, marked the words as his, gave reference to the page of his Hippolytus where they are found, and added the following intimation of my dissent: "To me, I confess, the critics on all sides, Bunsen by no means excepted, appear to pronounce far too positively on the age and primitive form of such early ecclesiastical remains" (p. 222).

him? Was he really born in the skies? And how is he to get back? Or perhaps is this "mere poetry in the guise of religion"? For my own part, I do not understand what is meant by "*mere* poetry," or by the antithesis in which it is set with "religion." Poetry that is not in earnest,—that does not escape from prose precisely because of its earnest depth,—is an imposture and no poetry at all. And religion that can stop short of poetry,—that can take itself for prose science and only step into the "property-shop" of the Muses for a little "decoration,"—is no less a lifeless semblance. Every attempt of the human heart to catch the inner meaning and feel the invisible essence of the world and life,—to strip their outer mask away, and let their ideal countenance and divine eye look forth,—seems to me to be poetic; and not at all to lose this character when made under the sense of those personal spiritual relations which fix certain lines within the Christian's universe. The measureless nature of all affection corresponds with something infinite in the object it seeks; and that which transcends finite expression can only hint itself in symbol, gleam in through some opening of analogy, or touch some kindred though distant chord. Hence all the language of religion is fundamentally poetry, the determinate forms of Christian theology itself being only representative shadows of ineffable truth; and the soul is set into most genuine accord with divine things, not by resting in the shadow as the light, but by using it as the parable of a higher glory. Whatever breaks the seals of narrow habit and sets aspiration and affection free, disposes to this, and elicits the tones at once of poetry and prayer. When reverence and love turn intensely towards absent but living beings, like Christ in heaven, the mental realization which breaks into apostrophe stands in the stead of the real but unattainable presence; it atones to the heart for its exile; it vivifies the trust in the meeting ere long; yet all the while is known to be but a "one-sided communion," the soliloquy in which faith escapes its sadness.

To the question, "Why is Christ to be the only sacred object in the universe towards which we must restrain apostrophe?" the answer is sometimes given, "Because orthodox strangers will take it for prayer." Is it, however, right that our religious communion should direct itself by side-glances towards those who may overhear it? or, that it should pour itself out—a simple unburthening of ourselves as we are—just as if no outer world were by? To me, I confess, the study of effects in religion, the habit of regarding its services as a kind of public advertisement of belief, are among the most repulsive and alarming features of our modern Christianity. They sometimes tell the story of their tendency plainly enough: as when, at an anniversary meeting, a vote of thanks was moved to the minister who introduced the service, with the commendatory words, that "a more eloquent

prayer was never addressed to—a *Boston audience*.” Not very different is the criticism on this or that hymn as inappropriately addressed to a mixed audience. As organs of Christian faith and piety, we have nothing to do but to let them shape themselves forth by their own inner law, and expand to full volume by the sap of their own truth. It is not for us to lop off any blossoming branch, merely because neighbouring boughs are intertwined and the spectator may think it grows upon another stem. Occasions enough will arise, without mutilating the expression of our religion in hours that are purely its own, for clearing up the confused apprehensions of external listeners.

Throughout Dr. Beard’s critique there is a tone of theological insinuation, and even of personal reflection, which, however essential to his argument, I deplore as unseemly. Doubts are studiously intimated whether the editor of certain hymns may not be a secret Swedenborgian, or perhaps a Ditheist; whether his profession of strict Unitarian worship may not have been made in a non-natural sense; whether he is unaffected by “the tendency in some quarters at present” towards Justin Martyr’s “dyad;” whether he seriously cares at all for religious truth, and does not in effect teach that it is much “the same thing whether you worshiped a *fetich*, provided you did worship, or the Maker of the universe.” The volume on which these suspicions are founded has been in my critic’s hands for twenty years. It was produced side by side with another work in which I had some share,—a work not deficient in doctrinal distinctness,—the Lectures in the Liverpool controversy. Both were published in the same year; and the Hymn-book proves nothing now which it did not then. What has it to do with “present tendencies in some quarters,” except so far as they may serve to point a convenient but wrongful moral against it? Unless my critic believes that the Liverpool Lectures also covered some idolatrous scheme, he has in them a key to the fundamental theology of the Hymn-book which leaves his hinted suspicions against the compiler without excuse.

I am said to “place nearly on a level truth and doctrine on the one side, and sentiment and taste on the other” (p. 306). These two “*sides*” I do not know: the “*level*” which blends them and makes them one I do. “Sentiment” in religion other than “true,” and “truth” other than solemn and grand, seem to me mere verbal unrealities. And the only reason why I tenaciously cling to the type of poetry which I have been defending is, that it saves and intensifies a *truth* which else is abated of its full rights in the human soul,—the reality of that divine society of which Christ is the living head.

London, May 14, 1861.

JAMES MARTINEAU.



## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*The Progress of Religious Thought as illustrated in the Protestant Church of France; being Essays and Reviews, bearing on the chief Religious Questions of the Day, translated from the French; with an Introductory Essay on the Oxford Essays and Reviews by the Editor, John R. Beard, D.D.* London—Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 8vo. Pp. 383. 1861.

THIS collection of Essays, translated for the most part from a French Protestant Review issued at Strasburg (now bearing the title, "Nouvelle Revue de Théologie"), would have been at any time attractive; its appearance at the present time, when the thoughts of many are at work on the great questions of theology and biblical interpretation which it discusses, is very timely. To some extent, the French Protestant writers whose thoughts now for the first time appear in an English dress, run parallel with the seven Oxford Essayists and Reviewers. The divergence from them of some of these French Protestants ought to increase our interest in the labours of M. Colani and his intelligent fellow-workmen.

"While the Oxford 'Essays and Reviews' are effective in either undermining or battering down strongholds of religious falsity, they scarcely present the positive side of true religion with sufficient fulness and prominence. Yet the most effectual way to displace error, is to place truth in the human mind. The present volume therefore exhibits the Gospel in most of its important aspects—first, God, and God's relation to the universe, and especially to the human mind; second, Christ, and his true and rightful authority in the soul; third, Christ's religion in its essential harmony with science; fourth, Revelation in its general character, and in its particular exhibition in the Bible, leading to direct and distinct statements of what the Bible is, and what the Bible contains."—Preface.

The Strasburg pastor, T. Colani, contributes to this volume an essay on the general principles of Christian Truth, under the title, "Views and Aims;" a second essay on the contents of the Bible; and a third on the Simplicity of the Gospel. From Dr. Reville's account of the writers, we learn that Colani was brought up under orthodoxy in its strictest forms. But though he in the first instance accepted the popular faith, his earnestness and mental independence soon alienated him from it. His residence on the borders of Germany, and his being a pupil of Professor Reuss, helped on this result. He connected himself with Scherer on his rupture with orthodoxy. Admirably qualified as he was for professorial duties, he was yet shut out from every chair by the resolute opposition of the orthodox party. An accident opened another path to Colani. Called upon to preach for a sick pastor at Strasburg, he developed unexpected pulpit talent; and presently, borne on the strong tide of popular approbation, he overcame the hesitation or the dislike of the Directory, and took his rightful place among the recognized religious teachers of Strasburg. His sermons have had a large circulation, and are disseminating liberal principles among the Protestants of France.

Colani is earnestly Christian in all his speculations.

"With all the faculties of our soul we embrace the salvation which is in Christ. Jesus is the object of our love—true love comprises instinct, will, intelligence. We love Christ because he first loved us. We scrutinize and analyze our love in order to purify it, to strengthen it by contemplating the

perfection of its object. We have no division in our Christianity—this for the head, that for the heart, the third for the life; but we aim at flooding it with the entire stream of our being. The task is great and noble; by our own strength we could not accomplish it—we should fail miserably. But He, for whose glory we intend to labour, will not desert us, but rather shew himself mighty in our weakness.”—P. 9.

In the sermon entitled, “What there is in the Bible” (pp. 343—361), Colani shews that it teaches, not science, but the rule of life. The subject is treated in a very fragmentary and popular way, as in a sermon it needs must be; but his views all tend to the results of a scientific and free, but still reverent, theology.

A single extract will shew how Colani illustrates his theory of the simplicity of the gospel.

“The gospels are the biography of a man who lived eighteen centuries ago. You read it as you would read any other narrative; but I know not how, this man has a secret charm, which so attracts, so moves, and so governs you, that you cannot refuse to give him your heart. Little by little you adopt all his thoughts, you experience all that he experienced, and behold! you are transformed into the image of a wise man and a prophet shall I say? No, but into the image of God himself, for this unknown one, this sage, this prophet, is the perfect man, the Son of God. Sublime simplicity of Christianity! provided the heart be entirely subdued, the rest appears indifferent.”—P. 361.

Another contributor to this volume is Dr. Albert Reville, a minister of Rotterdam. The brief autobiographical sketch of this eminent man is full of interest.

“I was born at Dieppe, in Normandy, the son of a pastor there, whose recent loss I am still mourning. My father brought me up in his own liberal ideas, as they were taught at Geneva. Whilst very heretical in matters of doctrine, I was quasi-orthodox in matters Biblical. My own reading, my knowledge of German, and the *Revue de Théologie* have brought me to the point at which I now am. Desirous, as far as might be in my power, of assisting in the revival of the Theology of French Protestantism, and in rectifying the common notions of Christianity, I accepted a pastorate offered me at Rotterdam, in 1859, although out of my native land, in the hope that I might find there some time and more opportunities than in the most of the churches in France, to devote myself to this work. My hope has not been disappointed. I have succeeded in gaining for myself a certain name in connection with French Protestantism, and even beyond that limit. My writings in the *Lein*, *le Disciple de Jésus Christ*, the *Revue de Strasburg*, etc., etc., have contributed to propagate what I believe to be the truth, and have even drawn upon me the attentions of readers whom I little expected; I mean men like Renan, Laboulaye, etc., who have opened to me the door of extensive Parisian publicity. I have entered in, and I quite hope to remain inside. I have made an opening through which better men than I am will pass, and I am well pleased at having been able to make it. Just now there is in the press at Leyden, a treatise of mine, on the Origin and Composition of the Gospel of Matthew, a treatise which I wrote in answer to a question professed by a Theological Society of this country. My answer received the prize offered for competition, and has procured me the degree of Doctor of Theology. Four or five years ago, I was all but appointed professor at Montauban. Happily I was spared that misfortune. Montauban being the seat of authority where four or five ignoramuses set themselves up to lay down the law for the world, I should have been stifled in such a stove. From the seclusion of my Dutch study, I send forth my shafts against orthodoxy, when and how I will; four French Protestant Journals are at my disposal, the *Revue des Deux Mondes* and the *Revue Germanique* are open to me: what would I have more?” Pp. vii, viii.

Dr. Reville is by his mental constitution and his style of writing qualified to view his subjects in a more abstract and philosophical aspect than Colani; but his conclusions are as scriptural and satisfactory. After summing up the principles of Christianity, he says:

"Here is something that is indestructible. Indestructible is it even when you have allowed independent and strictly historical criticism to apply itself in full liberty to the evangelical narratives. And now we turn with confidence to the men of our age whose heart is right, saying to them: Do ye not desire such a religion? inspect it closely; Christianity is more than *a* religion, it is *the* religion, the religion realized."—Pp. 85, 86.

Probably no essay in the volume will attract, as we believe none deserves, more attention than that entitled, "Religion and Science reconciled on the Ground of History." To those who are familiar with the speculations of Strauss, the essay on the "Future Life" will be welcome as a successful confutation of the subtle philosophy of that very remarkable writer. The last contribution of Dr. Albert Reville is an essay on "The Authority of Jesus Christ," in which much profound wisdom and ingenious speculation are combined with a gentle and trusting Christian faith.

Dr. Scholten, a Leyden Professor, the most distinguished theologian of Holland, an adept in the German philosophy, contributes an essay on "Modern Materialism and its Causes." It approaches nearer to the spirit of our Oxford essayists than the other portions of this volume. The writer accepts Christianity in its moral and spiritual rather than its historical evidences.

Dr. Edmund Scherer is too far advanced in his opinions to be now a Professor of Theology in Geneva. His contributions to this volume, viz. essays on Catholicism and Protestantism, on the Errata of the New Testament, on the Nature of the Bible, and on the Miracles of Jesus Christ, are, we think, written too much in the style of negation. There are a few passages which have a more conservative appearance, and might lead us to suppose that we have failed to gain a correct idea of the writer's purpose.

M. Grotz, a pastor of Nismes, contributes an essay on the Notion of Revelation, in which he puts aside miracle and prophecy as of little value in attesting divine revelation.

The contributor of the closing essay is M. Renan, the first orientalist in France, Catholic by education but Protestant by sympathy, one who, if he may not yet be classed among liberal Protestants, is daily diminishing the space that separates him from them. The subject of this essay is John Calvin, and it exhibits the leading traits of that great but unamiable man most distinctly to the mind. Take a specimen passage:

"Intolerance was the inevitable consequence of the character and position of Calvin. Whenever a man allows himself to be mastered by an opinion which he holds to be a complete, absolute and evident truth, to such an extent that you are guilty if you do not accept it, he is of necessity intolerant. At the first view Calvin offers a strange contradiction in eagerly claiming liberty for himself and his associates while sternly refusing it to others. But in reality, all this is very simple; he believed differently from the Catholics, but he believed as absolutely as they. What is now regarded as the essence of Protestantism in its birth, namely, freedom of belief, the right of each one to form his own creed, was scarcely known in the sixteenth century. Doubtless that appeal from the Church to Scripture which was the soul of the Reforma-



tion, would not do otherwise than in the long run turn to the profit of criticism, and in this sense the first Reformers are the harbingers of free thought. But this they were without either knowing or wishing it. The Catholics have with some reason said of the French Revolution—'Effected against us, it has worked for us:' the philosopher may say the same of the Reformation. History presents many instances in which the doctrines of a party, and the occult tendencies of that party are in full contradiction. In the quarrel of the Jesuits and Jansenists, the former maintained a doctrine more conformed to reason, and more respectful for liberty than that of the latter; and yet Jansenism was at the bottom a liberal movement, and so a movement around which honourable and cultivated men might naturally rally."—Pp. 375, 376.

Our space forbids our doing more than indicate the contents of this very interesting volume. The merits of the essays are by no means equal, and some of the views expressed are such as we should be sorry to regard as the necessary consequences of intelligent and free thought on theological subjects.

The introductory essay by Dr. Beard on the suggestive topic of the Oxford volume, is not the least valuable portion of the book. Some of the discriminating remarks which he suggests in reference to the English "Essays and Reviews" are applicable to this French volume.

As to the translation, we have not had the means of comparing it with the originals, but it reads smoothly and pleasantly.

Of the printing of the volume we cannot give much praise; and in these days of correct typography, the number of errata we have noted is rather a surprise.

---

*The Difficulty of Understanding the Bible. A Sermon preached at St. Thomas's-Square Chapel, on Sunday, March 3, 1861. By the Rev. William Kirkus, LL.B. Pp. 29. The Book Society, 19, Paternoster Row.*

THIS is one of the not few strange results of the Essays and Reviews. The intelligent and respectable author of this Sermon—the minister of an Independent congregation, the present representatives of the oldest Nonconformist society in Hackney—preached and printed it to record his disagreement from the popular cry, that the Bible is a book the whole of which everybody can understand; and also to express a fear that what he sees going on in the religious world, the attempt to "submit the difficulties of Biblical criticism and interpretation to the decision of a numerical majority, is dishonest and demoralizing, and is preparing the way for an apostasy and infidelity compared with which 'German Neology' will look small indeed." The utterance of words like these is a significant fact. It shews no small degree of moral courage in our author.

The Sermon itself is a remarkably thoughtful and candid utterance. Mr. Kirkus, without disputing the fact of progress, contends that it is a somewhat rare thing for men to try to *understand* a subject, and that religious knowledge is no exception to this rule. Carelessness in reading the Bible he regards as only a particular case of a far more general carelessness. It is Mr. Kirkus's aim, not only to impress the reader with the great difficulty of interpreting scripture, but also to point out the best mode of doing it. What impression has been made upon Mr. Kirkus's mind by much of what is written on religious subjects, the following passage will shew:

"The dishonesty of religious controversy has become almost as proverbial

as the bitterness of theological hatred; and nothing is more common than to find men charged with believing that of which they have over and over again in express words affirmed the opposite. It would be unfair to take it for granted that their writings have been abused without being read, though it is quite impossible not to perceive that at most they have been read without being understood."—P. 10.

Mr. Kirkus asserts the necessity to every man of intellectual and moral cultivation, before the Bible can do its intended work for him :

"We can render a reasonable obedience to Holy Scripture only when we perceive it to be *good*, and only if we have an independent power of determining what is good, and of detecting and rejecting what is not. For there are many books which claim the right, as the Bible is often supposed to do, to over-ride the conscience, or even to render it unnecessary, not to say highly inconvenient. There are many pretended revelations which can only be accepted by those who have put off the burden of a sense of duty. That which is common both to these and to the Bible is a *claim to Divine authority*, which is far more unmodified and obtrusive in them than in it. That which is *peculiar to the Bible*, on what may be called its moral side, is that it does not stupefy, but guide the conscience; that it makes constant appeals to the knowledge of duty which men already possess; that it does not construct for them an entirely new road of conduct, but only urges them onward in that very same road, a part of which they have already travelled over; that it is therefore always in harmony with human experience and the ordinary laws of moral growth and development, confirming the lessons that our whole life is teaching us. If, then, we would 'understand what we read' in Holy Scripture, if we would discover its real excellences, if, also, we would avoid being misled by its counterfeits or rivals, we must keep a firm hold of what we already know of God and of the law of our own lives, with which every genuine revelation cannot fail to be in harmony. The relapse of many into the superstitious follies of Romanism, and the history of Mormonism, may warn us how easily, even in these days, men may be made the dupes of any book, or any man who is not ashamed to lay claim to a special commission from God." Pp. 18, 19.

Mr. Kirkus, in maintaining the necessity of a man's applying to the Bible all the knowledge and wisdom derived from history and experience, treats lightly enough the popular theory of the inspiration of scripture :

"If we are to wait for some undisputed theory of inspiration by which to guide our judgment or repress our curiosity in the study of Scripture, it is in the highest degree improbable that we shall begin that study at all. No undisputed theory, not even any very generally received theory of inspiration so much as exists. Whether and *in what sense* the Bible is 'infallible' is still an open question, and not likely to be at all quickly closed. And surely the nature of inspiration and the infallibility of our sacred books must be determined, not before reading them, but after; indeed, how otherwise than *by* reading them? If we find no errors, and if other readers can find none, the perfect accuracy of the Scriptures may, of course, be affirmed; but the value of that affirmation will depend entirely on the care with which they have been read, and the perfect liberty of criticising them which has been granted even to those who might have been their enemies. If there has been no careful and thorough examination of the Bible, whether this has been the result of the want of liberty or of the want of inclination, all theories of inspiration must be almost equally worthless."—Pp. 21, 22.

After dwelling on the specialty of the Bible, in respect to the languages in which its original was composed, the age and social conditions of the various writers, and the advantages which result from the Bible being the work not of one author but of many, he remarks,—

"The Bible is not easier than Plato's 'Republic,' or 'Hamlet,' or Blackstone's 'Commentaries,' or a treatise on Chemistry, or Mill's 'Logic:' yet every one of these requires for its appreciation considerable culture and special study. If a person who knew nothing about chemistry should utter a pompous opinion about the result of some difficult analysis, and accuse everybody who differed from him either of stupidity or dishonesty, he would be considered either an impudent knave or a lunatic. But when a man who knows *nothing whatever* of Egyptian history utters a pompous opinion about Bunsen's conclusions, and charges him with heterodoxy or even dishonesty for having arrived at them, this is considered not only justifiable but extremely religious: though it is quite impossible for all unsophisticated persons to see how it differs for the better from picking pockets. There are very many decisions which may safely be entrusted to a numerical majority; the decision of difficult questions of biblical criticism is not among the number."—Pp. 28, 29.

In conclusion, Mr. Kirkus points out as the three duties of the reader of the Bible,—diligence in getting at the true meaning of scripture, caution and modesty in giving expression to theological conclusions, and perfect charity towards all who differ from us.

When sentiments like these are uttered by a professedly "orthodox" preacher, we have a significant token that a great change has come over our times, that influences are at work which may and probably will entirely remould the theological beliefs and religious tastes of multitudes in the Christian church. May the bud and blossom of truth, which look so promising, be matured to the precious fruit!

*Poems upon various Subjects.* By James R. Withers, Fordham, Cambridgeshire. Pp. 214. 1861.

SEVEN years ago Mr. Withers, then struggling with poverty and depression, first appeared before the public, uttering with simple beauty his "native wood-notes wild." Time and literary cultivation have refined his taste and not diminished, but increased, his power. The present volume is a great improvement on his previous works.

A passage or two from the Preface disclose how James Withers became a poet:

"To a mind properly attuned to nature's harmonies there is music in the chirping of the grasshopper, in the droning of the humble-bee, in the hum of the 'shard-born beetle,' in the sighing of the trees, the chiming of brooks, the rustling of the corn on the hills, the grating of the sedges by the water-courses, and the chaffing of the reeds by the rivers; the tingling of the sheep's bell and the bleating of lambs, the jingling of the team and the creaking of the wain, the plough-boy's whistle, and the hay-maker's song are all musical to me; and the commonest flower that lifts its face to the sun has poetry legibly written upon it. The rural muse is moved by rural sights and sounds. Nearly all my life has been passed in a quiet village in an agricultural district, where I had but little chance of associating with company of any pretension to refinement of mind. I yearned for purer pleasures than those, that I mingled with, pursued; I pined for intellectual acquirements, and 'no man gave unto me.' I could not live upon the husks, and was starving, as it were, amongst strangers, when I said, 'Nature shall be my book, and I will read it, my delight, and I will enjoy it, my theme, and I will sing of it.'

"I have been a shepherd boy, a pig-keeping boy, a bird-scaring boy, and a stone-picking boy; I have been a tiller of the ground, and a reaper of the crops thereof; but in all these occupations, however prosy in themselves, I found scattered some lines of poetry. In winter, if I shivered at my task,



there was the beautiful hoar-frost on the trees and hedges to admire. If I was drenched with the showers of spring, there were the opening buds, and the violets and primroses to cheer me with promises of brighter days. If the heat of summer oppressed me, there was the freshness of the dewy morning, the sweet noontide hour, when I ate my bread beneath some cooling shade, and the calm rest of evening—all mine own. And in the busy, toiling harvest, there was poetry in the rows of sheaves, and even in the popped stubble, whilst the fading and falling leaves were to me a source of pleasing melancholy. And thus, I have proved the truth of what the great poet said, that there are 'books in the running streams, sermons in stones, and good in everything' if we will but search them out. The great and wise Disposer of events has so ordained it that none here are exempt from cares and sorrows; and on the other hand, none are without some share of happiness and enjoyment. The rose is not free from thorns, and the thistle is not without flowers."—Pp. iii—v.

There is an exquisite little poem in the volume, describing the last thoughts and words of a simple girl of twelve years of age contemplating the immediate approach of death. It is entitled, "The Loosening of the Silver Chord." Another genuine poem is entitled, "Spirit of Beauty." It is essentially autobiographical. A verse or two follows:

- "But since that day some years have flown,  
And I have care and sorrow known;  
I've journey'd on with aching feet,  
Hungry, weary, faint, and poor:  
I've asked for alms along the street,  
And begg'd my bread from door to door;  
I've slept beneath the open sky,  
And winds have sung my lullaby.
- "I've seen profusion on their board,  
Who would not me a crust afford;  
Then by the road-side sat me down,  
Away from man's cold heartedness,  
From mastiff's growl, and menial's frown  
Who added insult to distress.  
But Nature! wheresoe'er I came,  
Thy smiles of welcome were the same.
- "I've labour'd through the summer's day,  
From morning's dawn, till evening grey;  
But when I reap'd the golden corn,  
Or till'd the harden'd stubborn soil,  
Such beauty did the fields adorn,  
That threw a halo round my toil.  
And I have felt thy presence near,  
Spirit bright! my heart to cheer."

---

*Syriac Miscellanies, or Extracts relating to the First and Second General Councils, &c., translated into English from MSS. in the British Museum and Imperial Library of Paris.* By B. H. Cowper. Williams and Norgate. 1861.

THIS is not an unimportant contribution to our knowledge of the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople. The Epistle of Constantine summoning the Council of Nicæa informs us of a yet earlier Council which met at Ancyra, in Galatia, which explains, according to Mr. Cowper, a sentence in the Second Apology of Athanasius, which speaks

of a former Synod before that of Nicæa. The Nicene Creed, as given by the Syriac writer, ends with the words, "We believe in the Holy Ghost," thus omitting all mention of its being a person; as in the preceding clause it had omitted that Jesus was incarnate by the Holy Ghost. This new and important feature was added by the Council which met at Constantinople. The Creed put forth by this second Council with these new particulars was the same as our present Nicene Creed, except of course that it did not contain the celebrated clause *Filioque*.

The Syriac MS. gives us also an incomplete list of the Bishops who met at the Council of Nicæa, which does not wholly agree either with the Greek or Coptic lists, and has perhaps as good a claim to be trusted as either of the others. The canons of the Nicene Council in the Syriac are from an older MS. than any before known.

The list of Bishops who met at the Council of Laodicea is here published for the first time.

From Hippolitus we have an account of the heresy of the Nicolaitans, which included a denial of a resurrection of the flesh.

The volume contains a variety of items, some historical and some chronological, and may help to clear up many obscure points in ecclesiastical history.

S. S.

*Bible Inspiration vindicated by Sound Interpretation alone: a Lecture delivered in the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, on Tuesday Evening, April 30, 1861, in Examination of an Essay by the Rev. John C. Miller, D.D., &c. &c., entitled, "Bible Inspiration Vindicated."* By Samuel Bache, Minister of the Congregation. 8vo. Pp. 35. London—Whitfield; Birmingham—Grew. 1861.

THIS pamphlet deserves a much longer notice than we can now give it. It has the clearness and ability which those who know Mr. Bache will anticipate, and it is an admirable specimen of the candid and gentle temper in which Christian writers ought to conduct controversial discussions. Speaking in criticism on and reply to a neighbouring clergyman's vindication of "Bible Inspiration," Mr. Bache never for a moment forgets what is due to Dr. Miller or himself. He states the views he contravenes in the language of their author, and discusses them with unflinching temper and courtesy. It is something new for a controversial lecture to be dedicated, as this is, to the gentleman whose opinions it criticises, and for the dedication to contain evidences of personal regard too strong to be touched by intellectual differences. One short extract will shew how Mr. Bache has handled his subject:

"I agree with Dr. Miller entirely in the opinion that Inspiration is not mere genius. It pains me, as it does him, to hear the word Inspiration applied, in mere prosaic statement and argument, to signify nothing more than that action of the Divine Spirit which *ordinarily* originates and sustains what is good. Believing as I do that the action of the Divine Spirit has been, in connexion with certain objects, *extraordinary*, and in that connexion *infallible*, I am not one whit more ready than he is to annihilate the important distinction."—P. 9.

The title which Mr. Bache has prefixed to this very instructive lecture is less clear than the argument itself. The inspiration there contended for is not of the Bible, the book, the history, but of the revelation of which the book is the record.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The thirty-sixth anniversary was celebrated on Wednesday, May 22. The religious service was conducted in the neat and convenient chapel at Brixton. Soon after eleven o'clock a numerous congregation assembled, including Unitarian ministers from almost every part of England, a very considerable number being present from the North. There were also present Mr. James Stansfeld, M.P., Mr. Elhanan Bicknell, Mr. H. S. Bicknell, Rev. C. H. A. Dall, and by his side a noble-looking Hindoo, Rakkal Das Haldar (the pundit whose translation of Rammohun Roy's "Precepts of Jesus" has had a wide circulation in Hindostan), Abdool Mussih, the Persian (a convert to Unitarian Christianity from Mohammedanism), Rev. W. H. Channing (who has just accepted an invitation to become the pastor of the Brixton congregation), Alderman Clarke Lawrence, Mr. E. C. Whitehurst, and nearly all the officers of the Association. The devotional service was conducted by Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge. The sermon, preached by Rev. Charles Beard, of Gee Cross, the author of "Port Royal" (recently reviewed in our pages), was a noble discourse on the Duties and Hopes of the Unitarian Church. As we do not doubt that it will immediately appear in print, we will not do it the injustice of presenting a mere skeleton outline, but ask our readers to await and profit by its publication. The close attention of the large congregation for more than an hour attested the skill of the preacher in rousing and sustaining by his thoughtful wisdom and his brilliant eloquence the interest of his hearers. At the close of the religious service a collection was made from pew to pew for the Association, amounting to £33. 18s. 4d. A large proportion of the congregation remained to take part in the business meeting, under the presidency of Alderman Clarke Lawrence.

Mr. J. E. Clennell, as Financial Secretary, read the Treasurer's report, which shewed receipts for the year 1860 amounting to £1109. 9s. 4d., and an expenditure amounting to £829. 5s. 3d.

Rev. R. B. Aspland next read portions from the Committee's report. Together with that document, he produced a series of reports from the Correspondents of the Association, which, though important and interesting, it was impossible then to read,

but which he said the Committee would be happy to print *in extenso* in the forthcoming report.

For extracts from the report, which embraced the condition and prospects of Unitarianism in India, Australia, Transylvania, Italy and at home, we have but little space left. We select some very interesting documents which relate to Transylvania.

### Extract from a Letter from Mr. John Paget.

"I am happy to have to report to you that our prospects of religious liberty were never more brilliant than at present. I believe if we do not gain all we wish in political matters (and I do not by any means despair of that), in the religious question I feel no doubt. Austria has seen too clearly the danger of interfering with Protestantism in Hungary ever again to burn her fingers at that fire. The firm, bold, moral resistance offered by the Protestants of Hungary when the Austrian Government attempted to force on them a new religious constitution, instead of one founded on historical rights—the result of a compact between prince and people—has secured the triumph of religious liberty in these lands, it is to be hoped, for ages to come. It is a curious sign of the times, that most of the leaders of this movement, then condemned to prison for their resistance, are now the trusted advisers of the Crown or members of the Diet.

"The Protestants of Transylvania escaped this trial to which their brethren in Hungary were exposed, as it was decided in Vienna not to introduce the new system here till it had been adopted in Hungary. The Unitarians, therefore, were not called upon to take a part in this struggle, as in Hungary proper there are no Unitarian communities, although by an Act of the Diet of 1847, or 1848, the Unitarian was made one of the acknowledged religions in Hungary, and placed on the same footing as the Calvinistic and Lutheran Churches.

"As a national Government has now been established both in Hungary and Transylvania, there can be no doubt that the Unitarians will again enjoy complete independence in the government of their churches and schools. Within these last few days, as a first instalment, after eight years' continued refusal, they have received the authorization to elect their Superintendent or Bishop. The choice is likely to fall on Professor Székely, the present Vice-superintendent, or on Professor Kriza,



the Secretary. The schools, too, will probably be re-organized, independently of all Government influence, in the course of the summer. The Consistory will lay before the Synod of the Upper Consistory a proposition for making the English language a part of the course in the Theological Seminary, by which means at least every pastor and professor must be acquainted with our language.

"The first volume of an Unitarian Annual is about to appear here, under the title of *The Christian Seed-sower*, edited by Professors Kriza and Nagy, which will contain original and translated sermons, lives of eminent Unitarians, and other matters of interest to the Unitarian body. This first volume will contain a translation of sermons of Messrs. Tagart and Channing, and a life of Mr. Tagart."

A Letter from Rev. John James Tayler, A.B., Principal of Manchester New College, London, to Rev. Moses Székely, Bishop-substitute of the Unitarian Churches in Transylvania, and President of the Holy Consistory.

"Rev. Sir,—As we are entirely strangers to each other, I hope you will pardon my freedom in addressing you. Between the churches, however, of which we are respectively ministers, there has existed now for some time a kind of relationship and an exchange of good wishes. Of our countrymen when a few years ago the lamented Tagart, and more recently Steinthal, a young man full of zeal, visited Transylvania, they were received everywhere as old friends and with an overflowing hospitality. These proofs of your kindly feelings towards us give me so much encouragement, that although we have never exchanged a word or a look with each other, yet in mind, and, if I may so express myself, with a secret sympathy, I am fully persuaded that we are already sufficiently acquainted. Add to this, a young man of your country, of excellent disposition and talents and of remarkable industry, Domokos Simén, is at this very time pursuing his philosophical and theological studies with us in London. For myself, I hope that others of your countrymen, like Simén, whom we rejoice now to have as a pupil, or those excellent young men, Ferentz and Buzogáni, who were living amongst us two years ago, will come and visit our churches and college, so as to acquire a more perfect knowledge of us who share in your religious faith, and to take back with them to your country, so distant from ours, new hope and a firmer strength for sustaining the cause of truth. Under these circumstances, nothing seems to me more desirable than

that on matters which may be of common benefit to our churches and colleges on both sides, we should occasionally correspond, once at least in every year. In this way I have not a doubt that we may afford great assistance and encouragement to each other. For instance, there may be books, especially such as from time to time appear among us on theological subjects, and yet very tardily and after a long interval reach, if indeed they ever reach, your remote corner of the world, which nevertheless you might very much wish to see, and which we should have the greatest pleasure in transmitting, as occasion offered, to Clausenburg. You on your part will have the opportunity of repaying this favour with a greater, if you would forward to us an exact description of the titles and contents of the books, whether printed or manuscript, on the history, controversies, doctrines, &c., of our Unitarian church in past times, which, as we are informed, exist in great abundance in the library at Clausenburg; and if among them should be found any worthy of being committed to the press, as likely to throw new light on ecclesiastical history, it might deserve consideration whether, by the united efforts of you in Transylvania and of us in England, such works should not be given to the world. Certainly, the simple publication of the titles and contents must confer a great benefit on literature.

"There is another point on which I wish to add a few words. I have already spoken of Simén. He has made great proficiency with us, especially in our language. He now both speaks and writes it with considerable ease. You will naturally wish to know what studies he is at this time principally attending to. They are as follows: 'Experimental Philosophy' under Professor Potter in University College; in our own Academy, 'Hebrew' under Mr. Russell Martineau, a pupil of the celebrated Ewald's; 'the History of Christian Doctrines' under Mr. Jas. Martineau, Professor of Moral Philosophy; a course on 'the Truths and Evidences of Christianity' under me as Professor of Theology. If any of your countrymen are likely to succeed Simén in our schools, which I earnestly hope may be the case, we particularly request you to forward their names as early as possible. For entering advantageously on our course of study, it is above all things desirable that your young men bring with them the following attainments: an accurate acquaintance with the rudiments at least of our tongue, and with elementary mathematics—and, in addition, of the Latin language and literature (which yet flourishes with a

certain native vigour in your country), as also of the Greek a still more thorough knowledge. On these foundations once duly laid all the higher learning may be safely built up.

"A most sacred interest, if I mistake not, is committed, Rev. Sir, to you and to us; and our most fervent prayers must be offered in one spirit to the great and good God that we may ever preserve it with unwavering fidelity. If I at all understand our position, into our hands the Heavenly Father has in great measure committed the very weighty cause of Christian simplicity and freedom such as it existed in the first age of the church. Let us, therefore, strive with all our might to restore to our Judge at last, when our days are numbered, the deposit which he has entrusted to us, undiminished and enriched. But they who have undertaken to preserve it, and have a clear understanding, as they suppose, of the genuine religion of Christ, are a feeble and scattered few. Wherefore they ought to be bound to each other by a closer tie of affection, and to gather their scattered forces into one.

"Will you favour me with an answer at your earliest convenience? Our yearly May meeting is at hand. What a pleasure you would afford our churches if we could have the privilege of reading to them, when assembled together, a reply from you in the name of the brethren of Transylvania! Farewell, Rev. Sir, and ever keep me in your heart as a friend with fraternal affection.

*"London, April 16, 1861."*

Translation of a Letter from the Rev. Moses Székely, of Aranyos Rákos, Bishop-substitute of the Unitarian Churches in Transylvania, and Ecclesiastical President of the Consistory, to the Rev. John James Tayler, B.A., Principal of Manchester New College, London.

"With deep joy of heart I received a few days ago, with every feeling of friendly trust, your letter addressed to me, and have deemed it my very agreeable duty to write you back an immediate reply. Intercourse between the churches, of which at the present time you and I are respectively the ministers, commenced properly by letter about fifty years ago, in person thirty years since, when I had the good fortune, through the Divine mercy and the liberality of your countrymen, to visit the shores of England and see the brethren belonging to the churches of London and York; among whom I feel myself bound at this day to express my heartfelt thanks to the distinguished gentleman, John Bow-

ring, who is so great an ornament to your Christian society; while, alas! most of the excellent and eminent scholars in those days known to me—fellow-workers, now of cherished memory—Fox, Rees, Edward Tagart, at that time Secretary of the aforesaid London Society, have departed this life.

"Of your countrymen, within the same space of about thirty years, we have had the happiness of adopting your excellent brother and fellow-citizen, Mr. John Paget, as a brother and fellow-citizen of our own, to whose zealous services on our behalf our brethren are under so many obligations. More recently we have enjoyed the opportunity, through God's goodness, of welcoming and entertaining with such hospitality as our country could offer, though it could hardly be called overflowing, as they visited various parts of our beloved Transylvania, first our deeply-regretted friend, Mr. Tagart, and then your distinguished brother, endowed with such admirable qualities of mind, Mr. Steintal.

"Although, therefore, Rev. Sir, we are unknown to one another by face, we are still united by the mutual ties of faith and charity and friendship; and on this account, in compliance with your invitation, I gladly engage in the correspondence for which you have expressed a wish in your letter.

"No doubt you are aware that the ancient rights of our Christian community, established for many centuries past by the laws of our country, confirmed and corroborated by long usage, have, within the last twelve years, been withheld from us by the stern rule of the Court of Vienna; and all this time, having been deprived of the power of choosing our Superintendent (*præpositum*) and of regulating the affairs of our schools, we have been overwhelmed with heavy expenses and, to speak the truth, with an oppressive servitude.

"Now at length, with the rise of happier times, our spirit is coming back to us again, all our rights, laws and canons having been restored to us anew. We have proposed, therefore—I may say, resolved—to hold a general Congregation or Synod, as well as a Supreme Consistory, in the last days of the ensuing month of June, for the purpose of electing on that occasion a Superintendent of the churches—in fact, a Bishop—and of freely discussing the state of our churches and schools according to the tenor of our institutions.

"For nearly three centuries past, from the very commencement of the public establishment of the Unitarian religion in our dear country, it has been a custom with us, in force to the present day—with a view to the benefit of our literature and religion

—from time to time, as circumstances have seemed to demand it, to send the most promising of our youth, usually at the public expense, in former centuries for the most part to the celebrated universities of Holland, but in the last and present century to those of Germany, to obtain a wider and more varied culture. Amongst such might be mentioned the very distinguished men, at this time public Professors in our College at Clausenburg, the Revds. Joseph Ferenz and Aaron Buzogány, the former of Mathematics, the latter of History, who on their return from the universities of Germany, impelled by a desire to see your countrymen also, happily landed on your shores, to greet you as beloved brethren; and for your many marks of hospitality, kindness and liberality bestowed on them, I hasten to offer to you and your countrymen, in the name of mine, our deserved thanks.

"But we cannot omit all mention of the promising young man, Dominic Simén, who has been so recently confided to the charge of the London brethren, and whom the brethren here have fully determined to assist with a fixed annual allowance, for the more effectual prosecution of his studies. We further accept with gratitude the proposal of your countrymen to establish a permanent fund for the benefit of the young men who may henceforth be sent to your country for their education. This living intercourse, as I may call it, already begun by three of our countrymen who have very recently visited England, we are, one and all of us, eager to support and cherish for the future; from our conviction that it will prove a means of the greatest strength, honour and usefulness to our Christian commonwealth in general, and especially here in Transylvania, if from time to time we shall receive back amongst us young men versed in your language and literature, more deeply imbued with the spirit of the Unitarian doctrine, or well instructed in other branches of science.

"Meanwhile, you should understand that only the Supreme Consistory has any right and power of deciding in this matter. On which account I will not fail to announce to you, as speedily as possible, the deliberations and decisions of the next ensuing Supreme Consistory; at the same time intending to commence a mutual correspondence, forasmuch as nothing seems to you more desirable than that on matters affecting the interest of our churches and academies on both sides, there should occasionally, once at least, if not more frequently, in the course of a year, be an exchange of letters between us, so that we may encourage one another. We promise

in all earnestness, now and then in the course of the year, and especially in spring, to send you a statement of all matters of importance respecting our churches and schools.

"In the hope of making some return for your liberality in transmitting books to us, I will shortly forward to you—though recent times have been very unfriendly to literary pursuits with us—a list of books treating of the doctrine and history of our (Unitarian) religion, with a somewhat ample description of their contents; a task which the keeper of our library has been directed to undertake. I shall further transmit to you the following books:

"(1.) A specimen of our symbolical theology, with this title: 'Summa Universæ Theologiæ Christianæ secundum Unitarios,' published at Clausenburg, in one volume, 1787. We promise to make you a present of more copies, or, if you think proper, a copy for any of your churches or pastors that may wish it; for in our library we have more than 1000 copies.

"(2.) 'Our Catechism,' in the Hungarian language; reprinted many times within the last two centuries: the last edition at Clausenburg, 1857.

"(3.) 'The Hymns and Psalms used in our Public Service,' recently rendered anew into our language. New edition, 1837.

"(4.) 'Funeral Hymns or Chants,' enriched with some fresh additions, and adapted to our language. Reprinted 1856.

"'Annals,' written in the Hungarian language, and entitled, 'Keresztény Magveto.'

"Please to observe that you will receive these books a few days later than my letter.

"With regard to new materials, illustrative of our ecclesiastical history, I would remark, that Francis Poszto Uzoni, formerly pastor of our church in Bágyon, wrote, in two volumes, in a clear and elegant style, in Hungarian and Latin, an account of the origin and subsequent propagation of our religion in former centuries. Of this excellent historical work we possess only a single copy in manuscript. On the credit and authority of the aforesaid excellent historian, from about the middle of the last century more especially, several smaller works and manuals, still existing in MS., for the use of students, were prepared and put forth by the following distinguished men—Michael Lombard Abrahami, Stephen Agh and Alexander Székely, at different periods bishops of our church. At the present time, one of our countrymen, Stephen Kovacs, a historian well known, and I may add, of high reputation, among all Hungarians, is engaged in writing a history of our religion and commonwealth.



"As a conclusion, Rev. Sir, to all that I have now said, we assure you and yours with perfect sincerity, that it will be a great delight to us, if you shall be able to receive this letter of ours before the celebration of your approaching annual Association; in respect to which I cannot conceal how much I am grieved to be prevented, as well by the wide distance which separates us, as on account of other almost insuperable obstacles, from taking part in it. But, as some compensation for this, I earnestly entreat you, Rev. Sir, to have the goodness to offer the salutations of my truly fraternal affection not only to your approaching Association collectively, but to each of its living members individually, among whom, however, we possess a personal acquaintance with one alone—our beloved brother, the excellent Mr. Steintal, who lately spent some time with us. On which occasion, I beg you to express the deepest feelings of my mind, briefly concentrated in the following words:

"God, our Heavenly Father, grant that your Association may from year to year strike firmer and deeper roots, to the end that, as citizens and members of the Unitarian church or commonwealth, acknowledging one only God, the Father, through his son Jesus Christ, in the spirit of truth, ye may be able, not only in a few corners of Europe, America and Asia, but throughout the world on both sides of the ocean, in the course of the present and future centuries, to raise a continually richer and more abundant harvest of pure seed in the field of our Lord Jesus Christ; and may He bring it to pass that we and you, as living members of the church or heavenly kingdom of Christ, may be able to pass at length, by the aid of the great and good and all-powerful God, from our hitherto passive condition into one of real activity, and, should God help us, of general prevalence in the world, or at least to herald its approach."

"And now, my truly respected Sir, farewell; and ever keep me in your heart as a friend with fraternal affection, as I shall you."

"*Clausenburg, April 28, 1861.*"

The reading of the report was followed by addresses from Rev. Edward Higginson, of Swansea, and Rev. Samuel Bache, of Birmingham, and at their recommendation the meeting unanimously passed a resolution to the effect, "That the reports of the Treasurer and the Committee now read be accepted and approved, and that they be printed and circulated, with such additions or alterations as the Committee may determine on."

Then followed a very beautiful address from Rev. J. J. Tayler in moving the resolution (which was seconded by Rev. Samuel Martin and unanimously adopted by the meeting), "That the Members of this Association desire to offer a cordial welcome to the Rev. C. H. A. Dall, the Missionary at Calcutta of the American Unitarian Association; that they express their cordial sympathy with him and their desire to strengthen his hands in his work as an Unitarian Missionary, and trust that through his labours and influence many may be brought to the knowledge of the One True God, and of Jesus Christ, His beloved Son."

Mr. Dall, in acknowledging the welcome, stated some facts bearing on his mission at Calcutta, its increasing success, and the better tone of feeling which was manifesting itself in the East towards Unitarian Christians. In conclusion, he introduced to the meeting his friend and fellow-worker Rakhal Das Haldar, who had accompanied him to Europe to bear his testimony to the greatness of the work which invited the labours and generosity of Unitarian Christians in the great empire of the East.—The next addresses were from Mr. Herbert New, of Evesham, and Rev. John Gordon, of Dukinfield, who in a few happy and emphatic words characterized the sermon of Mr. Beard and acknowledged Mr. Martin's portion of the service, and gave the meeting the opportunity of expressing by resolution their appreciation of the discourse. It was adopted amid general applause, and was appropriately acknowledged by Mr. Martin and Mr. Beard.—Mr. E. C. Whitehurst in a brief but effective address proposed the adoption of a Petition to both Houses of Parliament for the total abolition of Church-rates. The resolution, seconded by Rev. Edmund Kell, of Southampton, was unanimously adopted. The Petition agreed to was this:

"To the Honourable the Commons in Parliament assembled.

"The humble Petition of the Members of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, assembled at their Annual Meeting, held this 22nd day of May, 1861:

"Sheweth,

"That your Petitioners are Protestant Nonconformists, precluded by conscientious scruples from joining the worship of the Church established by law.

"That your Petitioners build or repair their own churches, pay their own ministers, and defray the other expenses of their own worship, without, so far as the Unitarian Churches of England, Scotland and

Wales are concerned, aid from Government or any public rate.

"That your Petitioners hold it to be a violation of religious liberty to compel any man to support religious worship of which he neither partakes nor approves.

"That the continuance of the present system of compulsory Church-rates, besides being in some cases an invasion of individual religious liberty, is injurious to the public peace, and lowers the respect for religion, and even weakens the legitimate influence of the Established Church.

"That your Petitioners, believing that there is no other remedy for the evils of the present system, humbly pray your Honourable House to agree to a total abolition of compulsory Church-rates.

"And your Petitioners will, as in duty bound, ever pray, &c."

Mr. W. T. Malleon then called the attention of the meeting at some length to the practice of some of the Courts of Law in questioning witnesses as to their religious belief before allowing them to give evidence, and moved a resolution on the subject, which, having been seconded by Mr. W. C. Venning, was adopted. The resolution was—"That it be an instruction to the Committee to consider whether and how far the civil rights of Unitarians are compromised by the practice of Courts of Law to inquire into the religious belief of a witness before allowing him to be sworn; and that, if they see fit, the Committee be empowered to take a legal opinion on the subject, and to adopt such other proceedings as they may think the case requires."

In the absence of Mr. James Heywood, Mr. Frankish moved a resolution (a copy of which had been previously submitted to the Committee), which was accepted by the meeting, altering Rules 22 and 23, and giving the Committee power, if they see fit, to choose some other day than Wednesday for the anniversary meeting.

The Secretary next moved a resolution (seconded by Mr. Shakspeare) appointing Mr. J. A. Turner, M.P., President for the ensuing year, and enlarging the list of Vice-Presidents. The following were most of the names enumerated: R. Andrews, Esq., Q.C., LL.D., &c. &c., Mountjoy Square, Dublin; Elhanan Bicknell, Esq., Herne Hill; Richard Greaves, Esq., Cliff House, Warwick, High Sheriff of the County of Warwick; Robert Lang, Esq., Bristol; Alderman J. C. Lawrence, Westbourne Terrace; Darnton Lupton, Esq., Leeds; Ivie Mackie, Esq., Manchester; Rev. J. P. Malleon, Birdhurst, Croydon; Richard Martineau, Esq., London; Herbert New,

Esq., Evesham; Thomas Richmond, Esq., Stockton-on-Tees; James Stansfeld, Esq., Jun., M.P., Thurloe Square, Old Brompton; Philip Meadows Taylor, Esq., Harold's Cross, Dublin; John Watson, Esq., Leinster Gardens, London; Rev. Charles Wicksteed, Hafod, St. Asaph; Thos. Wrigley, Esq., Timberhurst, Bury.

In proposing the name of Mr. Elhanan Bicknell, the Secretary said he had a most pleasing duty to perform, in communicating to the members of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association the fact, that Mr. Henry Bicknell had just placed in his hands a letter from his father, Mr. Elhanan Bicknell, containing a remarkable proof of his interest in their work and his confidence in the executive. The letter stated that it had been his purpose to leave a sum of money by will to the Association, but that he now thought it would be better to give the Treasurer the amount at once. The letter enclosed a cheque for £1000. The announcement was received with loud and general applause.

The programme of the day's business was here slightly interrupted by the adoption of a resolution, proposed by Rev. T. L. Short, of Bridport, expressing the gratitude of the meeting to Mr. Bicknell for his timely and munificent gift.

On the motion of Rev. T. L. Marshall, the following names were added to the list of Home Correspondents: Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Bolton; Rev. John Colston, Wilmslow; Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, Maidstone; Rev. Samuel Martin, Trowbridge; Rev. William Newton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Rev. A. W. Worthington, B.A., Mansfield.

The usual vote of acknowledgment to the executive officers for the efficient and satisfactory discharge of their duties, was passed, on the motion of Rev. Edward Talbot.—The Committee were (with the changes rendered necessary by the Laws of the Association) re-elected, Mr. Samuel Pett and Mr. Thomas Williams taking the place of Rev. J. P. Malleon and Mr. Edward Cobb.

In moving and seconding a resolution thanking the Brixton congregation for the very great kindness shewn in their reception of the Association, Mr. J. T. Hart and Mr. Alfred Lawrence alluded in terms of cordial congratulation to the bright prospect now opening before the congregation by the appointment of Rev. W. H. Channing as their minister. The resolution was carried amid general applause.

In answer to the Chairman's inquiry whether there was any further business, Major Mercer offered a resolution, noticing and correcting the omission from the report

of the name and services of Abdool Mussih, the Persian convert, whom he had brought with him to England, and expressing the desire for his present relief and future employment and remuneration. The resolution was seconded by Mr. Shaen. It was pointed out that the motion was irregular and inconsistent with the resolution unanimously passed by the meeting accepting and approving the Committee's report. The Chairman's suggestion that the resolution should be withdrawn having been declined by the mover, it was put and negatived.

The proceedings closed with a very cordial vote of thanks to Mr. Alderman Clarke Lawrence for the courteous and able discharge of the duties of the chair.

In the mean time the greater part of the company previously assembled in the chapel had proceeded to the Crystal Palace in carriages very kindly provided by the members of the Brixton congregation. This ride through a beautiful country was one of the lesser pleasures of the day. Arrived at the Crystal Palace, a very remarkable scene presented itself. The new and spacious dining-room,—perhaps the most beautiful hall available for the purpose in the world,—was filled with a company of between 400 and 500 ladies and gentlemen. The Chairman's seat was placed immediately behind the busts of three men who have in their several walks achieved literary and scientific immortality, and whose names are enrolled in the list of Unitarian Christians—MILTON, LOCKE and NEWTON. The attendance of friends, so much exceeding in number the intimations previously given, occasioned a little temporary bustle and partial discontent; but the indefatigable and judicious labours of the stewards, aided by the large resources of the place, soon calmed all irritation and supplied the wants of all the visitors. While dinner was going on, the Directors of the Palace kindly allowed the fountains to play, which were seen by a considerable number of the guests. In addition to the persons present at the chapel, were some gentlemen who had been prevented by other duties from taking part in the morning proceedings. The appearance of the Rev. James Martineau was welcomed with general applause. That venerable friend of civil and religious liberty, Mr. H. C. Robinson, was also one of the guests. A blessing was invoked by the Rev. Thomas Madge, and a thanksgiving beautifully sung by the members of the choir of the Free Church of Kentish Town, who at intervals during the afternoon sung a pleasing selection of glees. The chair was, in the much regretted absence of the Pre-

sident, Sir John Bowring, most kindly taken by Mr. James Stansfeld, M.P. Of the proceedings of the afternoon we cannot attempt any detailed account,—nor indeed is it necessary, as they have been given to the public through several channels, and with great fulness and accuracy by the *Inquirer* and the *Unitarian Herald*. The speeches of the Chairman, from his opening to his closing address, were full of thrilling interest, and called forth again and again rapturous applause. When we say that the addresses given included speeches from the Chairman, Rev. Samuel Bache, Rev. Charles Beard, Rev. James Martineau, Rev. W. H. Channing, Rev. C. H. A. Dall, and his learned pundit companion, and that with scarcely an exception all were in the best style of the several speakers, it will be understood that an afternoon of the highest interest and gratification was passed. Nearly the last rays of daylight were used before all the guests took their departure from that beautiful Palace. Before they left the dining-room, a collection was made in behalf of the poor Persian, Abdool Mussih, thousands of miles away from home, and greatly anxious to return to his wife and child and means of obtaining a livelihood, and Alderman Clarke Lawrence (Westbourne Terrace, London) kindly undertook to receive and apply subscriptions in aid of this poor and (we are assured) worthy man. It was the pleasant task of Alderman Lawrence to bring to a close the duties and pleasures of the day, never surpassed, if equalled, in the history of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, by proposing the richly won and cordially given thanks of the assembly to Mr. Stansfeld for his eloquent services in the chair.

#### THE GENERAL BAPTIST ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly of General Baptist churches was held, as usual, in Worship-Street chapel, London, on Whit-Tuesday, May 21st. A number of the ministers and other friends met to breakfast before the opening of the Assembly, which was fixed for nine o'clock. The Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge, was in the chair, and the Rev. W. H. Quinn, of Chatham, and Mr. F. Dyer, of Worship Street, were moderators. The opening prayer was offered by Rev. W. H. Quinn. The Rev. W. H. Black officiated as Secretary. The ministers present in the Assembly, beside the foregoing, were the Revds. J. Briggs, J. A. Briggs, T. B. W. Briggs, John Marten, M. C. Gascoigne, John Hill, D. Harwood, now of Deal, J. C. Means, T. Rix, H. E. Howse and Dr. Sadler, and



Mr. J. K. Smith, of Manchester New College (the last four as representatives of the churches at Mill Yard, Trowbridge and Worship Street); and there were representatives present from Bessel's Green; Dover; Dockhead (late), Mill Yard and Worship Street, London; Portsmouth and Trowbridge. Beside these members of the Assembly, many other friends were present during the day: the Revds. H. Ierson, T. L. Marshall and Dr. Harrison, of London; Brooke Herford, of Sheffield; Wm. Newton, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; M. Gibson, of Swansea; John Ellis, of Diss; E. Kell, of Southampton; Thomas Cooper, of Framlingham; Joseph Smith, of Lincoln; H. Solly, of Lancaster; H. Knott, of Plymouth; W. McCalister, of Woolwich; R. Shelley, of Newbury; J. L. Short, of Bridport; W. W. Robinson, of Hastings; Goodwyn Barmby, of Wakefield; and Messrs. E. S. Howse and J. D. H. Smyth, of Manchester New College.

The public service commenced soon after eleven o'clock; the Rev. W. McCalister read the Scriptures and gave out the hymns; the Rev. Brooke Herford offered the general prayer; and the Rev. John Lettiss Short preached an admirable sermon from John vi. 57, x. 10, and Galatians ii. 20, on the communication of spiritual life to the believer from the contact of his soul with the living Christ. The sermon was attentively listened to by a more numerous congregation than usual, and its publication was afterwards requested by a vote of the Assembly.

After the members of the Assembly and other friends had partaken of the refreshments provided in the vestry, the business was resumed and continued till past five o'clock. It had relation chiefly to the internal affairs of the churches and to the different funds connected with the Assembly, including "Priscilla Peirce's Charity," established in memory of the late Mrs. Peirce, of Dover, by a bequest of the late Mrs. Fordham, her daughter, which it is expected will soon be realized. The various officers of the Assembly were chosen; the Rev. H. E. Howse, of Reading, being re-appointed Treasurer of the Education Fund, and the Revds. J. C. Means, W. H. Black and J. A. Briggs, joint Secretaries to the Assembly and its Committee. The Assembly was closed with prayer by the Rev. J. C. Means.

The tea-meeting in the evening was also very well attended. The Rev. H. Solly was called to the chair, the duties of which he fulfilled with his usual ability; and some very interesting addresses were delivered by the Revds. S. Martin, H. Ierson, W. Newton, J. L. Short, G. Barmby, and

C. J. Darbishire, Esq., of Bolton. Hymns were sung before and between the addresses, and the whole proceedings of this animating and pleasant meeting were closed with prayer by the Rev. J. L. Short.

#### MAY MEETING OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

(From the *Monthly Journal of the American Unitarian Association.*)

The public meeting of the Association will be held this year, as usual, on Tuesday morning, May 28. The names of the speakers, and the subjects, will be announced in the daily papers and the weeklies.

The business meeting of the American Unitarian Association, for choice of officers and other matters of importance, will probably be adjourned, as in previous years, to Wednesday afternoon, May 29. The business to be acted on at that time cannot now be certainly known; since it will depend on the wishes of the Association, as well as upon the state of the times. We may, at that time, be in the midst of a civil war, which will make all matters insignificant, and render it quite impossible to attend to them. If, however, the condition of affairs permit the thoughts to be given to such matters, some such plan of operations as the following may be laid before the meeting for its consideration and decision:—

1. There shall be but one paid officer,—the Secretary; who shall do the duties now performed by the Assistant Secretary,—being in the office every day and all day, keeping the books, answering all business letters, and giving information to all comers. His salary to be fixed for this year at 1,000 dollars.

2. The rest of the business of the office to be divided among the members of the Committee, all of whom shall be chosen in reference to work. One shall edit the "Monthly," one conduct the foreign correspondence, one or more the domestic correspondence. The whole Committee shall meet oftener than at present,—perhaps once a week,—when the Secretary shall consult them in regard to any letters received by him about which he desires advice.

3. The missionary work of the Association to be confided to gentlemen living in different parts of the country, each of whom shall, for a certain compensation, leave his own church on certain Sundays, and preach in his State or its vicinity. Thus one missionary may be appointed for each one of the States where work is to be done, who shall be a true Episcopos, or

overseer of his own field, and make reports concerning it.

4. It shall be the policy of the Association to encourage the formation of Christian Unions of men and women to co-operate together in the study and practice of Christianity in those places where no Unitarian society exists. Such Unions may be aided by donations of books, and by occasional visits from the nearest Episcopos, or Missionary Bishop.

5. The funds required during the coming year for the purposes of the Association may be estimated as follows :—

	Dollars.
Indian missions .....	5,000
Missionaries, ten at 200 dollars .....	2,000
Missionaries, ten at 100 dollars .....	1,000
Churches aided, say ...	3,000
Young men aided in study	1,500
Books and tracts given away .....	500
Secretary .....	1,000
Office expenses, &c. ....	400
Rent.....	600
	<hr/> 15,000

6. To meet this, we have the income of invested funds, and the proceeds of the "Monthly Journal." Still, as so many unexpected demands are always made each year on the treasury of the Association, it should be the effort of the churches to contribute, as they easily can, the full sum of fifteen thousand dollars each year. All that is necessary is, that they shall agree to do it, and so do it systematically. We have some two hundred and fifty active churches in the body. Of these, some fifty may be able to contribute a nominal sum,—say, ten dollars each; one hundred more churches may give an average of fifty dollars each; fifty others might give one hundred; twenty, one hundred and fifty; twenty, two hundred dollars; ten might give two hundred and fifty dollars. This would amount to twenty thousand dollars.

All that is necessary, in order to make the Association active and efficient, is that the churches should agree to give it their united support. Unless they do this, it cannot accomplish the ends of its existence.

#### INDIA MISSION.

(From the *Monthly Journal of the American Unitarian Association.*)

[The last letters from Mr. Dall are dated Feb. 8 and Feb. 22. The first of these we give, almost entire, below. From the other we cull these facts :—

1. Mr. Dall does not expect to be in Boston before July or August. His health improves, and his work thrives as never before. "Letters from two rajahs are on my table," he says. He encloses one from a young Hindoo who had been reading "Chapin on the Lord's Prayer," and was much interested in it; and who signs himself "With some affection for Christianity."

Sergeant-Major Charles Cress is to supply Mr. Dall's place during his absence,—to preach for him, and to superintend the Mission School. Sergeant Cress is a man of experience.

Joguth, when he arrives, will probably be in the Mission School also.

The friends of the Mission, in England, have just shewn their interest in it by sending to Mr. Dall 1,313 rupees, or £100. This will almost repay the money advanced by Mr. Dall to the expenses of the school.]

Calcutta, Feb. 8, 1861,

Unitarian Mission House.

Dear Friend and Brother,—Until this year, I have had a small weekly congregation: I have now a daily one. This month closes six full years of absence from Boston and all that Boston has for me; but only since last May has our God provided me with a daily church. I have been accustomed to consider myself most fortunate, when *once* on the seventh day, or Lord's Day, I could look round about, and, from my Bible pivot, try to move thirty souls. *Daily*, now, I stand in the midst of a hundred and sixty or more,—my preaching-hour being from half-past two to three,—and lead them in hymns, which they sing with might and main; and in gospel-appeals, which are turned into the best Bengali by my hearty co-labourer, Dwarkanath Singhel; and in prayers, outspoken in unison in the Bengali tongue. No day passes without hymns, preaching, and prayer, emergencies excepted. To compare, now, this congregation with that weekly one of twenty or thirty listeners (now reduced to eight or ten comers, and occupying one or two hours of each Sunday morning with Bible-study, preaching, conversation, and social prayer):—

Well: At noon of the day before yesterday, came into me a circular-appeal for aid to the hundreds and thousands daily perishing with famine on the north-west borders of Bengal and in the Punjaub. This dire distress falling at this moment upon seven and a half millions of people, twelve and a quarter millions of rupees are needed at once to feed them, at the present prices of grain. Calcutta people—and chiefly Englishmen—have, in three days, placed up-



wards of thirty thousand rupees in the hands of the Famine Relief Committee ; promptitude in payment being literally life to the dying. Sixty thousand pounds sterling have just been given by Government (again by Englishmen and Christians),—that is, six *hundred* thousand rupees ; besides which, public works have been set a-going again, which had ceased for want of funds,—in order that this daily *extending* famine may, if possible, be stayed. Now, had I appealed strictly and only to my “Unitarian Christian church,” as requested in the circular of the Famine Relief Fund (all the moneyed ones, or nearly all,—like our true friend Richard Lewis, and others,—having been driven home from India by the miseries of Indian credit and finance), what should I have practically accomplished ? Possibly nothing. The doubling here, and more than doubling, of the cost of all the common necessities of life, compels our Christian friends to economize to the last *pice*. The day before yesterday, however, in my noon sermon, I spoke to a hundred and sixty-seven boys and young men about the awful famine. Tears were in our eyes, as we sang “The Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man ;” and every hand, to the tiniest, was raised in resolve to do what it could. Yesterday and to-day, the *pice* and *picayunes* (two-anna silver pieces) have been showering down upon the laps of the five working teachers, and into my superintending hand. I agree to double by my own gift whatever is raised, and point the children to the gifts of Dr. Hosmer’s (Buffalo) Sunday-school boys and girls,—which adorn our walls,—whose good deeds were similarly accomplished by *cent*-contributions. We shall probably send in to the fund, to-morrow, some forty or fifty rupees,—an offering of *Hindoo* children to the literally dying Heathen ! Will not the holy angels be glad, and the All-Father accept the gift ? They will : he will.

Such, I say, is the present attitude of your Mission in India. Tell our Committee so ; and bid them not let their hearts be troubled, when God gives them such co-operation with himself.

I have given you but one of the many things I meant to say in this letter. I wanted to have told you of Ram Mohun Roy’s son’s recent gift to us of a hundred rupees, and of a newly rising tide of public sympathy in our work. We are rejoicing just now in the fact, that our able friend and helper, Mr. Rakhal Das Halidar, one of the truest-hearted men in Bengal,—having been driven out of his once sweet home by his dear old father’s hatred to

Christianity, and having lately had reason to resign his well-paid post in the commissariat department of the garrison at Barrackpore,—comes to us, declaring with tears, that he is “nearer to Christ than ever before.” I have invited him to stay here at Our House for some weeks, and hope that his experience and calmness of wisdom will be of great assistance to our loved Philip Joguth, who, by the papers, will be among us in about a week. I have recovered some strength ; and as our school is exciting much public attention just now, and favourable comment in the leading journals,—as well as receiving visitation and examination by high Government officials, including Lord Canning’s *vice*, Sir Bartle Treve,—I cannot yet fix the day or the month of my starting for London and Boston. God be wi’ ye all and your brother,  
C. H. DALL.

#### UNITARIANISM IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

The annual business meeting of the Adelaide Unitarian church was held in December last, Francis Duffield, Esq., Cobden Grange, in the chair. The affairs of the congregation were found to be, all circumstances considered, in a satisfactory condition. The routine business of the yearly meeting was transacted, and addresses were delivered by the minister of the congregation and others to an audience apparently very attentive.

On the 28th of February, 1861, the annual social meeting, which was put off from 1860, in order that several friends expected from England, including Mrs. Woods and A. Sidney Clark, Esq., the Treasurer of the congregation, might be present at it, took place. It was held in Hillier’s Assembly-rooms, and about two hundred persons were present, tickets of admission being limited to members of the church and their immediate friends. The meeting was a very pleasant one, music, reading, &c., contributing to the enjoyment of the evening. There were no set speeches, but much interesting conversation seemed to shew and to increase the cordial feelings of those present.

#### A GENTLE BUT NOT UNDESERVED REBUKE.

One of the American Unitarian journals gives an account, furnished by one of its travelled correspondents, of the incivility experienced in an English Unitarian chapel on a public occasion. Suppressing all names, we extract portions of the letter, in the hope that better notions of chapel hospitality will soon prevail in all our churches. After describing the long walk of two American Unitarians to hear an eminent



preacher in one of our chapels, the writer proceeds :

"Using, however, no names at the door, we were at once recalled from the floor of the church by the terrified attendant, who would not compromise himself by promising us better success anywhere. Unusually fatigued, we paused, before ascending to the galleries, quite long enough for our position to be thoroughly understood by many of the congregation. All were far too nice to overstep that English *gaucherie*, which, once broken down, yields to such generous liberty.

"To the gallery, then, despite our mute appeal, we perforce ascended, and became comparatively comfortable in an empty pew. Just before the opening of the services, a lady entered, alone, the further extremity of the long pew in which we occupied two seats. She maintained a moment's uneasy silence; then gently addressed us :

"Really, I believe this is *not* a public seat."

"Can you tell us, madam, where we may sit? I hinted here. 'We have already been turned from the floor.'"

"Possibly, near the organ?" she questioned rather than replied, with a glance at a long array of empty benches.

"On the bare forms in front of the organ, and facing the clergyman, we had certainly no cause of regret, save the nervous sensation of intrusion, which, however unreasonable, it is often difficult entirely to control. \* \* \*

"Perhaps you will allow me to pursue the subject with a respectful inquiry. Are the minor virtues so inefficient in our pilgrimage, that Christian flocks so widely scattered appear to be ignorant of their plainest requisitions? How may we be led to the large deductions which might be drawn from the 'cup of cold water'?"

---

## OBITUARY.

---

THOMAS COOKE, Esq., of Newport, Isle of Wight, whose death, at the age of 78, is recorded in your last number, was the son of Thomas Cooke, Esq., of the same town, of whom an extended memoir is given in the *Christian Reformer* of 1836, p. 640. Early possessed of an independent fortune, and cultivating through life habits of reading, the subject of this brief notice acquired a fund of knowledge which rendered him an instructive companion and valued member of society. He was often consulted by his friends and neighbours in cases of difficulty. So great was the confidence felt in the rectitude of judgment of his excellent father and himself, that on one important occasion they were selected as the two fittest arbitrators in their native town by contending parties of orthodox opinions. He was an early supporter of British Schools, and was a member of the Isle of Wight Literary and Philosophical Society, to which he contributed some valuable information on archæological subjects. He was in the Commission of the Peace for the county, the duties of which he discharged with regularity and ability. For many years he was an active member of the Southern Unitarian and Southern Unitarian Fund Societies, and took an interest in the general progress of Unitarianism. At the time of the dispute between the Unitarian and Trinitarian members of the congregation of the Old meeting-house, Wareham, which led to the

secession of the former, he took a useful part in exposing what he regarded as the duplicity of the parties, by which the necessity for the Unitarian secession was occasioned. He was a constant attendant at his own place of worship and a liberal supporter of it,—the ministers of religion receiving at his house, as at his father's before him, a ready welcome and support. There are not a few of such visitants to the Isle of Wight who can remember the pleasure which he manifested in conveying them in his carriage to see the beauteous scenery of the island, at a time when access to it was not so easy as at present. He shewed his interest in the Newport Unitarian congregation by leaving it a tenement adjoining the chapel, and also bequeathing to it for the use of its ministers the half of his valuable library,—a bequest well worthy of imitation when we consider the difficulty in a small town of obtaining books, and of a young minister especially to obtain funds to purchase them. For many years he was one of the leaders of the Reform party in the Isle of Wight; but after the passing of the Reform Bill he joined the Conservative ranks, and lost much of that popularity which he had previously enjoyed. He was a kind master: the faithful servant who watched over him in his last and lingering illness had entered service under Mr. Cooke's father; another aged servant, long past service, he always treated as a confidential

friend. He had been twice married, and survived his second wife about three years, leaving no family.

E. K.

March 7, at Hobart Town, Tasmania, CAROLINE, relict of the Rev. John JOHNS, Minister to the Poor at Liverpool.

April 20, at Norwich, aged 9 months, MARION, daughter of Rev. D. DAVIS.

April 22, at Newton Abbot, Devon, Mr. THOMAS HATCH.

April 22, at her residence at Northampton, Miss ANNE ELIZABETH BAKER, in her 75th year.

April 27, at Bridport, Dorset, after a long and painful illness, Miss ANN CARTER, in the 67th year of her age.

April 30, in her 88th year, at Bandon, county Cork, Ireland, Mrs. MATTHEWS, relict of William Matthews, and eldest daughter of the late George Carpenter, formerly of Birmingham.

April 30, at Royston, aged 84, ELIZABETH, daughter of the late William NASH, Esq.

May 2, at Brighton, in her 89th year, SARAH, relict of Robert STEVENS, Esq., formerly of Lloyd's.

May 2, suddenly, ROBT. JACKSON, Esq., of 13, Gower Street, and 41, Bedford Row, London, aged 68.

May 4, at East Grinstead, Mrs. DOUBOLL, aged 85.

May 4, at the house of her son-in-law, Mr. Ryott, Newbury, Mrs. ELIZABETH LAMBIN, aged 87 years. The deceased was a thorough and consistent Unitarian, and a respected member of the congregation

assembling in the Upper meeting-house in the above town for upwards of fifty years.

May 8, EMILY, wife of Arthur TAYLOR, Esq., Canonbury Lane, Islington.

May 9, at Hull, after a short and severe illness, MARY WAWNE, the beloved wife of the Rev. John SHANNON, aged 36 years. She was niece of the late Rev. George B. Wawne, of Bridport.

May 9, at Torrington Square, in his 79th year, JOSEPH HUNTER, F.S.A., one of the Assistant Keepers of H.M.'s Records, formerly minister of the Unitarian chapel at Bath.

May 10, suddenly, WILLIAM BOARDMAN, Esq., of Swinton, near Manchester.

May 11, at Aylesbury House, near Birmingham, aged 53, deeply regretted, CHAS. AYLETT KELL, Esq., son of the late Rev. Robert Kell.

May 14, after a few hours' illness, at the residence of his grandfather, Mr. H. P. Buckler, Camberwell, Surrey, WILLIAM HENRY, eldest son of William Glover MACE, solicitor, Tenterden, aged two years and six months.

May 21, at 5, Bow Churchyard, London, suddenly, Mr. JAMES GITTINS, formerly of Shrewsbury, in his 66th year.

May 21, at 42, Gloucester Place, Hyde Park, the infant son of Thomas P. COBB, Esq.

May 22, FREDERICK SHARPE, of 32, Highbury Place, and 29, Clement's Lane, London, aged 25 years.

At Southampton, aged 76, MARY G. SARAH, the beloved wife of Thomas JOHNSTON, Esq., of that town.

## MARRIAGES.

Recently, at the Unitarian church, Adelaide, South Australia, by Rev. J. Crawford Woods, B.A., Mr. JOHN WILLIAM BAILEY to Miss GRACE CRAIG; WILLIAM HENRY GRAY, Esq., Frogmore, to ROSETTA, eldest daughter of John Stokes BAGSHAW, Esq., Adelaide; and JAS. DOVETON STONE, Esq., artist, to ELIZABETH, daughter of Mr. Walter FLINN.

At Upper chapel, Sheffield, by Rev. Brooke Herford, assisted by Rev. M. A. Moon, of Stannington, JOHN GRAYSON LOWOOD, Esq., of Spink Hall, Bolsterstone, to ANN MATILDA, daughter of the late Mr. Samuel DALTON.

May 11, at the Elder-yard chapel, Chesterfield, by Rev. F. Bishop, Mr. SAMUEL COPE to Miss MARY ASKEW.